

Theophrastus of Eresus, Commentary Volume 9.2

Philosophia Antiqua

A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy

Previous Editors

J.H. Waszink †
W.J. Verdenius †
J.C.M. Van Winden

Edited by

K.A. Algra
F.A.J. de Haas
J. Mansfeld
C.J. Rowe
D.T. Runia
Ch. Wildberg

VOLUME 136

Theophrastus of Eresus
Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence

Commentary Volume 9.2
Sources on Discoveries and Beginnings, Proverbs et al.
(Texts 727–741)

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/pha

Theophrastus of Eresus Commentary Volume 9.2

Sources on Discoveries and Beginnings, Proverbs et al.
(Texts 727–741)

By
William W. Fortenbaugh

With Contributions on the Arabic Material by
Dimitri Gutas



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Fortenbaugh, William W.

Theophrastus of Eresus. Commentary, volume 9.2, Sources on discoveries and beginnings, Proverbs et al. (texts 727-741) / by William W. Fortenbaugh ; with contributions on the Arabic material by Dimitri Gutas.

pages cm. – (Philosophia Antiqua, ISSN 0079-1687 ; VOLUME 136)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-90-04-26882-1 (hardback : acid-free paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-26876-0 (e-book) 1. Theophrastus. 2. Peripatetics. 3. Proverbs in literature. I. Gutas, Dimitri. II. Title.

PA4450.F67 2014

185–dc23

2013048956

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0079-1687

ISBN 978-90-04-26882-1 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-26876-0 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

for

Gen and Colin
Will, Monty and EBerry
Henry, Sam and Pipa

eight nifty grandkids

CONTENTS

Preface	IX
I. Introduction	1
II. The Sources	7
1. Greek and Latin Sources Belonging to Four Different Periods	8
i. The Hellenistic Period/ Roman Republic	8
ii. The High Roman Empire: no. 2–8	11
iii. The Carolingian Renaissance: no. 9–12	32
iv. Byzantium: no. 13–14	43
2. Anthologies: no. 15–16	44
3. Scholia: no. 17–20	49
4. Arabic Sources: no. 21–26	65
III. Titles of Books 727 no. 1–5, 137 no. 26a–b, 727 no. 6–11, 666 no. 4, 727 no. 12–16a–b	67
IV. The Texts	135
1. Discoveries and Beginnings: 728, 582, 729–736C, 718	135
2. Proverbs: 529A–B, 737–738, 738.5, 710, 624, 549	195
3. Unassigned: 739–741	235
V. Summary	243
VI. Bibliography	253
VII. Indices to the Titles and Texts	259
1. Important Words	259
Greek	259
Latin	262
2. Titles of Books	264
Theophrastean Greek	264
Latin	264

Arabic.....	264
Non-Theophrastean Greek.....	265
3. Gods, Persons, Groups of People and Places Named or Referred to in Greek, Latin or Arabic texts	265
VIII. Indices to the Commentary	269
1. Passages Cited in Chapters II–V.....	269
2. Subjects Discussed in Chapters II–V	290
IX. Corrigenda and Addenda in the Text-Translation Volumes	295

PREFACE

This commentary volume is the seventh to be published by Brill on the two-volume work *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*. Of the six volumes that precede, two were written by Bob Sharples (on physics and biology), two by Pamela Huby (on logic and psychology) and two by myself (on ethics and rhetoric-poetics). In five of the six cases, Dimitri Gutas contributed significant comments on the Arabic material. Now comes the seventh volume (on discoveries, proverbs et al.), which Bob Sharples wanted to write, but his untimely death intervened. Picking up the task fell to me. Fortunately, I had the support of several colleagues, of whom I mention four. Tiziano Dorandi helped me mightily with the papyrological material that is brought together under the heading Ἀτάκτα, "Unassigned." Dimitri Gutas continued his participation by supplying comments on Arabic titles. Stefan Schorn read through much of the manuscript, correcting philological errors and calling my attention to modern literature that had escaped my notice. Charles George not only read through the entire manuscript but also made the index of ancient sources. My hope for the future is to see all the remaining commentaries, those promised when the text-translation volumes were published, completed and made available to scholars worldwide.

Since I shall not author another volume in the Brill series, I want to take the occasion to step back in time and to mention several persons who took an interest in my work on Theophrastus and in so doing helped make the series possible. One such person is Herwig Görgemanns, who befriended me at the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington DC, when I was still, as it were, wet behind the ears (1967–1968). He encouraged me to improve my German, invited me to visit him in Heidelberg and subsequently sponsored a Humboldt fellowship (1976–1977), which enabled me to write *Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts* (1984). Another person is Hans Herter, who was much my senior and editor of *Rheinisches Museum*. He took an interest in my work on Theophrastus' *Characters*, accepted two articles for publication (1975, 1981) and invited me to lecture in German at the University of Bonn. That lecture was close to being a terrifying experience, but it moved me in the direction of German scholarship, so that I became acquainted with the writings of outstanding scholars like Hans v. Arnim, Otto Regenbogen and Franz Dirlmeier.

When I began to think of collecting, editing and translating the fragments of Theophrastus (quotations, reports, references in Greek, Roman and Arabic literature)—what would become known as Project Theophrastus—it quickly became apparent that I could not accomplish such a task alone. Hence, I began to cast about and came up with a provisional team (1979), all good people but only one proved to be a winner: namely, Pamela Huby. She was prepared to work with others and had the requisite training to take on the logical fragments. A different name was advanced by Richard Sorabji, who over the years has been a strong and loyal supporter of Project Theophrastus. He pointed to Bob Sharples as someone who not only could take over physics and biology but also had a philological competence that far exceeded anything to which I can pretend. There was still the need to find an Arabic scholar. Bob Sharples talked of learning Arabic, but my colleague at Rutgers, Fadlou Shehadi of the Philosophy Department, directed my attention to Dimitri Gutas, who completed the inner core, FHS&G. The four letters are arranged alphabetically, but happily they also represent the order in which the central players came together. Others would soon come aboard. I list four who were of especial help: Andrew Barker (music), David Mirhady (politics), David Sedley (papyrology) and Michael SOLLengerger (biography). Early on a loosely knit Advisory Board was formed. Members rotated on and off, but one remained a constant source of wisdom. That person was George Kerferd, whom I came to think of as the *sine quo non*. He not only offered scholarly advice but also set a tone that encouraged collegiality.

Although scholars in the humanities are used to working independently at their own university, Project Theophrastus needed financial support, in order that the members could interact conveniently, occasionally face to face, and pay for xeroxing and mailing, since email with attachments was as yet unknown. To meet the need, I decided to apply to the National Endowment for the Humanities for funding. The Rutgers Foundation, the fund raising arm of the university, took notice of my decision and assigned David Cayre to assist me. He left nothing to chance. We went together to Washington, where the two of us met with the responsible administrator. Three handsome grants were awarded over nine years (1980–1983, 1984–1985, 1988). During this period, biennial conferences were held at which issues related to Theophrastus were discussed. The conferences gave rise to a publication series, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities = RUSCH, which pleased the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Sciences, who decided to fund, albeit modestly, the publication series.

Two important steps along the way to publication should be mentioned. One was finding someone who could and would prepare camera-ready copy.

That was not an easy task, for we were dealing with texts written in three different languages: Greek, Latin and Arabic, each of which required its own keyboard. Here we were lucky. A younger colleague in the Classics Department at Rutgers, Aldan Smith, suggested his wife, Diane, who had studied Latin and Greek and was pleased to put her skills to good use, while supplementing the family income. We welcomed her to the team and she succeeded in creating a complex work: text with translation on facing pages, a critical apparatus of variant readings, an upper apparatus of parallel texts, notes to the translation, a concordance relating our edition to that of Wimmer and an index of ancient sources (1992).

The second step along the way was finding a suitable publisher. Given Theophrastus' importance as Aristotle's pupil and head of the Peripatetic School at the beginning of the Hellenistic period when the Stoics and Epicureans appeared on the philosophic scene, I naïvely believed that publishing houses would be eager to produce a complete collection of Theophrastean fragments together with a modern translation. But I was wrong. Oxford showed no interest, and although Cambridge nibbled, the press made clear that any accompanying commentary would be limited to one volume and that a short one. Crossing the Channel to the mainland, we found a better reception. At the time, Julian Deahl was head of Brill's Classics division. He understood the value of our project and arranged for publishing our work within the series *Philosophia Antiqua*. Soon thereafter Julian moved to head Brill's medieval division, but we continue to be welcome at Brill, not only publishing commentaries in the series *Philosophia Antiqua* but also three of Theophrastus' scientific *opuscula*.

When the fragments of Theophrastus were published and several commentaries were well on the way to completion, it seemed sensible to widen the focus of the conferences sponsored by Project Theophrastus and of the related publication series, in order to include Theophrastus' colleagues and successors in the Peripatetic School, e.g., Dicaearchus of Messana, Clearchus of Soli, Demetrius of Phalerum and Strato of Lampsacus. Until four years ago, that focus pleased the Dean of Arts and Sciences, who continued to contribute to the publication of RUSCH. Then came a new Dean and an acting chair of Classics from outside the Department. The latter froze all funds that had been acquired by Project Theophrastus for the specific purpose of holding a conference on Hellenistic ethics and publishing the proceedings in RUSCH. One year ago and with the appointment of a new President of the university, the Dean abruptly resigned and the acting chair was replaced. The conference has now been held (2013) and the proceedings will be published. Whether that harbors a bright future for Project Theophrastus remains to be seen. I am optimistic.

In concluding, I want to thank Connie, my wife of fifty-four years. She has supported my enthusiasm for Theophrastus, been a welcoming hostess when conferences came to Rutgers, and joined in my travels, when circumstances permitted. And that, while being the mother of our three children and the grandmother of eight. I've been a lucky guy.

WWF
Rutgers University
September 19, 2013

I.

INTRODUCTION

In 1992 a team of scholars, whose core members were Pamela Huby, Robert Sharples, Dimitri Gutas and myself,¹ published a new and all but complete collection² of the ancient and medieval sources for Theophrastus of Eresus, Aristotle's pupil and successor as head of the Peripatetic School. The collection, which carries the title *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Thought and Influence*, was reprinted in 1993 with corrections. The collection includes not only the ancient and medieval texts in Greek, Latin and Arabic but also English translations. It is divided into two volumes, which taken together run 1170 pages. Since the title of the two volumes is quite long, I shall often refer to "the text-translation volumes."

Nine commentaries were planned: vol. 1 on Life, Writings and Various Reports, vol. 2 on Logic, vol. 3 on Physics, vol. 4 on Metaphysics, Theology, Mathematics and Psychology, vol. 5 on Human Physiology, Living Creatures and Botany, vol. 6 on Ethics and Religion, vol. 7 on Politics, vol. 8 on Rhetoric and Poetics, vol. 9 on Music and Miscellaneous Items together with Indices. That plan has been modified, so that the texts dealing with Doxography have been separated from texts dealing with Physics and will be discussed along with those on Metaphysics, Theology and Mathematics in vol. 3.2. Physics has become volume 3.1 and Psychology is now the whole of vol. 4. Texts dealing with Religion have been separated from those on Ethics and will be discussed in their own volume 6.2. The volume on Ethics has become 6.1. Finally texts on Music have been separated from the Miscellaneous Items and Indices; they will be commented on in their own volume 9.1. The volume on Miscellaneous Items, i.e., that on Discoveries and Beginnings, Proverbs and three Unassigned texts, is now 9.2.

¹ Other contributors, whose names quite properly appear on the title page, are Andrew Barker, John Keaney, David Mirhady, David Sedley and Michael Sollenberger.

² Given that the collection was made before computer searches were common, the omissions are remarkably few. That said, I want to acknowledge our debt to Otto Regenbogen's extraordinarily detailed discussion of Theophrastus' surviving and fragmentary works (*Paulys Realencyclopädie*, Supplementband 7, 1940). For getting started, he was indispensable. A single example of omission is discussed in this commentary (738.5).

The division of commentaries might suggest that the several areas under discussion are discrete and for that reason can be treated independently of each other. That would be a false impression. There is noticeable overlap (e.g., Ethics, Politics and Religion), so that in the text-translation volumes, we have introduced references from one area to another. In the section that concerns us, that of Miscellaneous Items, there are references to two texts found earlier in the sections on Politics and Religion. To be specific, there is a reference from the discussion of Discoveries to text 582,³ which appears among the texts on Religion, and from the discussion of Proverbs to 624, which is found in the section on Politics. Indeed, it now appears that we were too cautious in making reference to texts that have been placed in other sections. Hence, in the present commentary, I shall suggest that in any second edition of the text-translation volumes there should be included additional references to texts not printed among the Miscellaneous Items. I shall also comment on these texts in the present commentary. See below.

Six commentaries have already appeared: on Logic (vol. 2 [2007] on texts 68–136) and on Psychology (vol. 4 [1999] on 265–327) by Pamela Huby; on Physics (vol. 3.1 [1998] on 137–223) and on Biology (vol. 5 [1995] on 328–349) by Robert Sharples; on Rhetoric and Poetics (vol. 8 [2005] on 666–713) and on Ethics (vol. 6.1 [2011] on 436–579) by myself. The present commentary (vol. 9.2) is my third. Its focus is the Miscellaneous Items: i.e., Discoveries and Beginnings, Proverbs and several Unassigned fragments of Philodemus (727–741). Originally we planned that the indices appearing in the last volume of commentary would be indices to the entire collection of sources. That idea was abandoned in favor of including partial indices in each commentary volume. Hence, the indices in the present volume will be focused on the texts that are brought together under the heading Miscellaneous Items and on the comments that are made concerning these texts.

The organization of the present commentary is the same as that of my second commentary, i.e., that on Ethics (vol. 6.1). There are nine chapters, of which Chapter I is the present Introduction. The next three chapters constitute the body of the commentary. Chapter II on the Sources takes precedence over Titles and Texts, Chapters III and IV respectively, for our knowledge of Theophrastus' writings and doctrines is largely dependent on

³ As in the text-translation volumes, so in the commentaries, bold font is used to signal the numbers of texts that we have printed. Bold font is used also in regard to lists of Theophrastean titles and other lists typically involving texts that are not printed (e.g., texts found in the surviving botanical treatises and in the scientific *opuscula*). Individual items are given an Arabic number not in bold font (e.g. 727 no. 1).

our sources. It is, of course, true that the botanical works of Theophrastus survive as do the *Metaphysics/On First Principles*⁴ and several scientific *opuscula*.⁵ Their importance is not to be diminished, but for many areas that captured Theophrastus' attention and still interest us today, our knowledge derives from secondary sources, which may or may not be reliable. Some reporters are careless and others are using Theophrastus for their own purposes. In addition, a source itself may be dependent on other sources, so that what might be called a secondary source is in fact a tertiary source or at still further remove. The arrangement of the discussion of sources is in part chronological, partly by genre and partly by language. See below, the introduction to Chapter II p. 7.

Chapter III on Titles of Books, is primarily concerned with Theophrastean titles that have not been listed elsewhere in the text-translation volumes, i.e., titles that have not been listed under Logic or Physics or any of the other areas into which the text-translation volumes are divided. These orphans are brought together in a list at the head of the section on Miscellaneous Items = 727. Some of the titles are related, and there is an attempt at coherence in the ordering of the titles, but the overall impression is that of a mixed bag. The list begins with lectures (no. 1–2) and ends with letters (no. 15–16). In between there are titles that mention problems (no. 3–5) and memoranda (no. 6–7). In addition, we hear of research (no. 8) and unspecified commentaries (no. 9), a work called *Robe* (no. 10) and one entitled *On Discoveries* (no. 11). After that come *On Wise Men* (no. 12), another title referring to an Aramean named Acicharus/Ahiqar (no. 13) and *On Proverbs* (no. 14). There are also references to titles listed elsewhere. Immediately after the three titles that mention problems (no. 3–5), reference is made to two works on problems that are listed earlier in the section on physics (137 no. 26a–b). And a reference to a rhetorical title, *On Invention* (666 no. 4), has been included immediately after *On Discoveries* (no. 11). These titles, too, are discussed in Chapter III.

⁴ On this work including the title *On First Principles*, see D. Gutas, *Theophrastus, On First Principles (known as his Metaphysics)*, (Leiden: Brill 2010) pp. 9–32.

⁵ There are now new editions of the *Meteorology* in Syriac and Arabic translation by H. Daiber and of *On Fish* by R. Sharples, both in *Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical and Scientific Writings* = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 5, ed. W. Fortenbaugh and D. Gutas (New Brunswick: Transaction 1992) pp. 166–293 and 347–385 respectively. Also of *On Sweat, On Dizziness and On Fatigue* by W. Fortenbaugh, R. Sharples and M. Sollenberger (Leiden: Brill 2003) and *On Weather Signs*, by David Sider and Carl Wolfram Brunschön (Leiden: Brill, 2007), attribution uncertain. A new edition of *On Winds* by R. Mayhew is in progress and will be published by Brill.

Next comes Chapter IV on The Texts, i.e. source-texts that report Theophrastean doctrine and its acceptance or rejection by contemporary and later writers. The discussion follows the order of the texts as printed in the text-translation volumes and divides into three sections. First comes discussion of texts dealing with Discoveries and Beginnings (728–736A–C); that is followed by discussion of texts dealing with Proverbs (737–738); finally three Unassigned fragments of Philodemus are discussed (739–741). Also considered is one text, 738.5, which was overlooked when the texts were first collected. If there is a second edition of the text-translation volumes, it should be printed immediately after 738. As mentioned above, there are two texts which are not printed among Miscellaneous Items but which are referred to: 582 is referred to from the section on Discoveries and Beginnings and 624 from the section on Proverbs. They will be discussed as will five other texts, 529A–B, 549, 710 and 718, to which references should be added in any second edition of the text-translation volumes. To be specific, reference to 718 should be placed at the end of the section on Discoveries and Beginnings after 736C. Reference to 529A–B should be placed at the beginning of the section on Proverbs before 737 and the references to 710 and 549 should be placed at the end: one before and one after the reference to 624. For greater precision, see “Addenda and Corrigenda” pp. 295–300.

In line with my earlier commentaries, the discussion of titles and texts is followed by a Summary, which is Chapter V. It is briefer than the earlier summaries in the commentaries on ethics and rhetoric-poetics, for the material covered is smaller. It is, however, like the earlier summaries in that it is intended to be a helpful overview of the preceding discussions, but it is no substitute for those discussions.

Next comes Chapter VI, which presents a Bibliography of Modern Literature. It includes all of the works referred to in the lists of Literature that precede each comment in the discussions of Titles and Texts. It also includes works that are not mentioned in the lists of literature but are mentioned in the footnotes on several occasions. References to other works that are mentioned on only one or two occasions are typically given in full in the notes. A second reference in close proximity to the first reference may be no more than the author’s name followed by “*op. cit.*”

Chapter VII contains three Indices to the Titles and Texts: 1) Pride of place belongs to the index of Important Words: Greek and Latin. It covers not only the titles and texts printed under the heading Miscellaneous Items but also important words found in the titles and texts to which reference is made. 2) Next comes an index of Titles of Books: Greek, Latin and Arabic. It covers not only the titles mentioned in the list of Theophrastean titles (727) but

also titles, both Theophrastean and those of other authors, mentioned in the texts. 3) Finally there is an index in English of Gods, Persons, Groups of People and Places mentioned in the texts either explicitly or by implication, i.e., by a pronoun or phrase or the ending of a verb, whose reference is clear.

Chapter VIII contains Indices to the commentary. One index catalogues the passages cited and/or discussed in Chapters II–V. The second is a subject index to Chapters II–V.

Chapter IX is a list of Addenda and Corrigenda. In addition to simple corrections (typos and the like), it includes one new text that was overlooked (738.5) and two replacement texts that contain improved readings of *Herculaneum papyri* (739 and 740).

II.

THE SOURCES

In this chapter, the sources¹ are discussed partly in chronological order, partly according to genre and partly according to language: 1. Greek and Latin sources arranged chronologically under four headings: i. The Hellenistic Period/Roman Republic (no. 1), ii. The High Roman Empire (no. 2–8), iii. The Carolingian Renaissance (no. 9–12) and iv. Byzantium (13–14); 2. Anthologies (no. 15–16); 3. Scholia (no. 17–20); 4. Arabic sources (no. 21–26). To facilitate finding the discussion of a particular source, I begin by listing the sources in alphabetical order, each of which is followed by its number. After that comes the discussion itself.

Abū-l-Farağ Ibn-aṭ-Ṭayyib 22	<i>Light of the Soul/Lumen Animae</i> 16
Anonymous on Aristotle's <i>NE</i> 5	Martin of Laon 10
Athenaeus 7	Michael of Ephesus 14
Al-Bīrūnī 23	Philodemus 1
Clement of Alexandria 6	Pliny the Elder 2
Diogenes Laertius 8	Plutarch 3
Dunchad 9	Remigius of Auxerre 12
Georgius Choeroboscus 13	Scholia on Apollonius of Rhodes 20
Harpocration 4	Scholia on Euripides 19
Ibn-Abī-Uṣaybi'a 26	Scholia on Homer 17
Ibn-al-Qiftī 24	Scholia on Pindar 18
Ibn-an-Nadīm 21	Stobaeus 15
John Scotus Eriugena 11	az-Zawzanī 25

¹ In this context, "source" refers to the primary source of a numbered text: that includes the titles listed under the heading "Titles of Books" (727 no. 1 etc. = vol. 2 pp. 584–588 FHS&G), the substantive texts that follow on the titles (728–741 pp. 588–599), a text to be added (738.5), texts that are referred to from the section on Miscellaneous Items (582, 624 = pp. 402–403, 466–469) and texts that should be (529A–B, 549, 710, 718 = pp. 348–351, 374–375, 556–557, 572–573). Sources of parallel texts that are mentioned only in the upper apparatus are not discussed in this chapter.

1. Greek and Latin Sources Belonging to Four Different Periods

i. The Hellenistic Period/Roman Republic

1 Philodemus] c. 110–140 BC

Philodemus was an Epicurean philosopher and poet, who hailed from Gada-
ra in Syria. He went to Athens, where he studied under Zeno of Sidon,
who was head of the Epicurean school.² From there Philodemus moved to
Italy (some time between 88 and 86 BC): first to Rome and then to Naples,
where he enjoyed a close friendship with Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoni-
nus, the father-in-law of Julius Caesar. He wrote extensively on ethics, reli-
gion, rhetoric, poetics and music, but much is lost, and what does survive
is found on rolls of papyri that were badly damaged during the eruption of
Vesuvius in 79 AD.³

Like Epicurus, who wrote a work *In Reply to/Against Theophrastus* (cited
by Plutarch, *In Reply to Colotes* 7 1110C = 280.1),⁴ Philodemus discussed the
views of Theophrastus and could be critical. That is clear in his work con-
ventionally referred to as *On Household Management*.⁵ There Philodemus
first criticizes Xenophon's dialogue *Concerning Household Management*,⁶
after which he attacks Theophrastus, claiming that the Peripatetic engaged
in irrelevancies, while failing to understand how household management

² Not to be confused with Zeno of Citium the founder of the Stoa (c. 334–261 BC) and Zeno of Tarsus the fourth head of the Stoa (fl. c. 210 BC).

³ For fuller but nonetheless succinct remarks, see E. Asmis, "Philodemus' Epicureanism" in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36.4 (1990) pp. 2367–2374. Her subsequent remarks on Philodemus' method, interests and writings merit a good read.

⁴ In Greek the title of Epicurus' work is Πρὸς Θεόφραστον. Since Plutarch refers to the second book (280.1), we can say that the work was at least two books long. The work is not listed in Diogenes' catalogue of Epicurean writings (*Life of Epicurus* 10.27–28), but that is unimportant, for Diogenes makes clear that his catalogue is not complete. Rather it presents the best of Epicurus' writings: τὰ βέλτιστά ἐστι τὰδε (10.27). Although the preposition πρὸς can be used without negative connotations, I agree with Huby, *Commentary* 4 on psychology p. 66 that in the present case πρὸς may be understood negatively. The translation *In Reply to Theophrastus* is not wrong, but *Against Theophrastus* captures what Epicurus intended. Cf. H. Essler, "Zu den Werktiteln Philodems," *Cronache ercolanesi* 37 (2007) p. 128.

⁵ The traditional title *On Household Management*, Περὶ οἰκονομίας, refers to Book 9 of Philodemus' multivolume work *On Vices and Opposing Virtues and the Persons in Whom They are and about What*. P.Herc. 1424 contains Book 9 but does not have the traditional title. Rather the subscript of the papyrus gives Book 9 and the title of the multivolume work. See Asmis, op. cit. p. 2385 n. 44 and the literature cited there.

⁶ Xenophon's work is a dialogue: the title Οἰκονομικός can be filled out with λόγος or διάλογος.

and politics relate to each other (P.Herc. 1424 col. 7.37–38.18 [BT p. 26.3–27.16] = 659). That said, it should be underlined that Philodemus not only recognized merit in writing about household management but also stated that some of Theophrastus' views were “not unworthy of consideration” and should be discussed with a view to adopting those that are useful (P.Herc. 1424 col. 27.12–35 [BT p. 73.20–75.1] = 660). That is sensible and reason for taking seriously what Philodemus says concerning Theophrastus. But it should be pointed out that Philodemus regards Theophrastus as the author of the first book of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Οἰκονομικά*, *Matters of Household Management*. The book is likely to belong to the early Peripatos, but that it is properly attributed to Theophrastus strikes me as unlikely.⁷

A different text is of interest not only for its content but also for the difficulties it presents. The text is taken from Philodemus' work *On Music* 3.35 = 720, in which the role of music in moral education is under discussion and Theophrastus is referred to by name. Since both Plato and Aristotle addressed the topic, we would expect Theophrastus to have done the same, but the text is lacunose, and attempts to fill the gaps involve conjecture. That is true at the very beginning. Something must be supplied and David Sedley has suggested that words like *μόγισ μὲν τοὺς ῥυθμούς* may capture the sense of what is missing. He also proposed filling out the opening lines as follows: [συνορ]ώντος Θεοφράσ[του π]ρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ τοῖς | [παισ]ιν μόνον, ἵσως δὲ | [πρὸς ἀ]κολασίαν συνερ[γούς ὄ]ντας. That is what we printed, and it is the basis of our translation: “Since Theophrastus sees that (rhythms barely) contribute to virtue and only for children, and perhaps they contribute to intemperance.” If that is correct, we have a text that may be thought to distinguish Theophrastus from both Plato and Aristotle in that it seems to assign slight importance to musical rhythms in moral training. At the same time, it leaves us wondering whether Theophrastus agreed with his predecessors in asserting the importance of combining words with music when the goal is to improve moral character. On Plato and Aristotle, see *Aristotle on Emotion* pp. 48–49, and on Theophrastus, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 362–365. Here I want to emphasize that the lines in question are seriously lacunose and therefore open to more than one interpretation. Indeed,

⁷ There are scholars lined up on both sides. For the literature, see Regenbogen col. 1521 and Mirhady pp. 240–241. I agree with U. Victor, (*Aristoteles*), *Oikonomikos* (Königstein Ts: Hain 1983) p. 167, when he says that the work was known to Philodemus under the name of Theophrastus, but as Victor makes clear that does not decide to whom the work is properly attributed.

in the new Budé edition (2007), Daniel Delattre offers conjectures that differ from those of Sedley. Instead of supplying μόγῃς μὲν τοὺς ῥυθμούς, he prefers μέλη and in the apparatus criticus suggests filling out the opening lines as follows: [μέλη ἐ]ὼντος Θεοφράστ[ου | [ἄγειν π]ρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ τοῖς | [ἄιδουσ]ιν μόνον, ἴσως δὲ | [τὸ εἰς ἀ]κολασίαν συνερ[γ]εῖν π[ά]ντας. Most interesting may be reading [ἄιδουσ]ιν μόνον instead of [παῖς]ιν μόνον. That shifts the focus from children to persons who sing, and μόνον, “only,” might be intended to rule out an ethical effect on persons who merely listen. Moreover, *if* μέλη refers to melodies and not to songs with words (lyric compositions), then [ἄιδουσ]ιν μόνον might refer to persons who do no more than hum the melody, so that the importance of words in moral education is not implied.⁸ That is the suggestion of Massimo Raffa, who will discuss the text in *Commentary* 9.1.⁹

In his work *On Rhetoric* 4 (P.Herc. 1007/1673 col. 13 [BT vol. 1 p. 173.1–23 Sudhaus] = 689A), Philodemus criticizes what has been written on metaphor, saying that it provides no practical help. He tells us that most writers deplore or exult metaphors, citing (the principle), “Harshness should be absent from even the apologetic metaphor,” as Theophrastus states, “which (metaphor) is mild and inoffensive, such as one that does not belong should be, just as when visiting a house.” The text is not free of lacunae and scholars can disagree on particular supplements, but a letter of Cicero to Tiro (*To Friends* 16.17.1 [BT p. 597.10–17] = 689B) enables us to say that Philodemus has correctly represented Theophrastus, who spoke of a metaphor that is apologetic (αἰσχυνομένην Phil.; *vercunda* Cic.) and described it as entering the house belonging to another (ἄλλοτρίαν, Phil.; *alienum*, Cic.).¹⁰

The preceding texts have illustrated some of problems involved in dealing with Philodemus, and the last offers a clear example of Philodemus reporting correctly. That is encouraging, but there are three fragments, 739–741, which are so short that little can be said about them. In the text-translation

⁸ I have printed “if” in italics in order to emphasize that μέλος can refer to both melody and music to which a song is set (LSJ s.v. B.2&3). For the latter, see Aristotle’s *Poetics* 2.1447b25 with the note of D. Lucas, *Aristotle, Poetics* (Oxford: Clarendon 1968) p. 61. Similarly ἀεῖδεν can be used for singing a song as well as singing without words, i.e., humming along. See ps.-Aristotle, *Problems* 19.10, to which Massimo Raffa has called my attention.

⁹ I add only that in Delettre’s edition conjectures appear in the critical apparatus. Lacunae are allowed to stand in the printed text, so that the casual reader is not misled into the thinking that the conjectures are unquestionably correct.

¹⁰ Strictly construed, in the Greek phrase, οἷαν εἶναι προσήκει [δ]ή [τιν] ἄλλοτρίαν, ὥσπερ οἶκ[ι]αν εἰσίουσαν, the noun μεταφοράν is understood with the adjective ἄλλοτρίαν. But the adjective is easily understood with the noun οἶκ[ι]αν, which follows. The relationship of ἄλλοτριότης goes in both directions.

volumes, they have been printed at the end of the section on “Miscellaneous Items” under the heading “Unassigned.” Less dignified but more descriptive might have been the heading “Scraps.”

ii. *The High Roman Empire*

2 Pliny the Elder] 23–79 AD

The Pliny that concerns us is the uncle of Pliny the Younger,¹¹ who greatly admired his uncle’s capacity for work and wrote a letter to Baebius Macer, in which he provides a list of his uncle’s publications as well as brief remarks concerning his life. According to the nephew, the elder Pliny was industrious in the extreme: while eating and while being rubbed down after bathing, he employed readers and secretaries in order that he might not lose time for learning and writing. And while traveling, he was accompanied by a shorthand writer, who in winter wore gloves, in order that the cold weather might not interrupt his studies (*Epistles* 3.5.11, 14–15).¹² Modern scholars who have embraced research and publication as all-fulfilling, may find this picture of Pliny quite appealing, but taken by itself it is a caricature that ignores other aspects of his life: he experienced military service in Germany, practiced law, held various procuratorships and commanded the Roman fleet at Misenum. Indeed, it was in Pliny’s role as commander of the fleet that we see the whole man. In a letter to Tacitus, the nephew describes the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD and reports how not only scientific interest but also a desire to rescue others caused his uncle to cross the Bay of Naples to Stabiae, where he was killed by noxious vapors (*Epistles* 6.16.7–20).

The earliest of Pliny the Elder’s writings concerned throwing the javelin on horseback, his patron Pomponius Secundus (two books) and the Germanic Wars. Subsequent works dealt with grammar, rhetoric and Roman history. His last work was the voluminous *Natural History*. It has come down to us in c. 130 manuscripts, runs for 37 books and can be said to deal with nature in its entirety. After an initial book that provides *inter alia* a list of Greek and Roman source authors, the work divides into two parts, each containing 18 books. The first part may be said to deal with nature *per se* and

¹¹ Pliny the Younger (c. 61–112) is perhaps best known as the author of ten books of letters that had real recipients but were polished for publication. He had a public career, becoming praetor in 93 and consul in 100 AD. His *Panegyricus*, written in an elaborate style and highly complimentary of Trajan, was delivered in the Senate upon entering the office of consul.

¹² Cf. Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, preface 18 on his own work habits. See Beagon (1992) p. 56.

the second part with nature in relation to man *qua* doctor and caregiver.¹³ Although the length of the work, the variety of topics and the numerous diverse sources encourage one to view and to use Pliny's *Natural History* as an encyclopedia to be consulted as needed but never read through, recent scholarship has taken an interest in the work as a whole and argued that it is "a truly valuable source on the ancient world."¹⁴

Throughout Pliny's work, Theophrastus is cited 80 times. In the preface, he is mentioned once as part of a defense against critics,¹⁵ and in Book 1 within the index of subjects and authorities which is organized by books (i.e., Books 2–37), he is named 27 times. The other 52 citations are found throughout the work.¹⁶ Pliny's index is extensive (in the Budé edition it runs 104 pages), but it is faulty in that some authors are omitted when they should be cited, and others are cited when no corresponding (named) text can be identified in the relevant book. In the case of Theophrastus, we can say that he is omitted from the index to Book 7, even though he is named in that book on three occasions. He is mentioned in the index to Books 12, 14, 18, 23, 24 and 35, but in these books his name is not found. See text 138.

In the present commentary, our special concern is Book 7, Pliny's "anthropology," in which texts 731–733 are found (7.197, 195, 205). At the beginning of the book, we are told that great nature appears to have created everything else for the sake of man: *cuius (sc. hominis) causa videtur cuncta alia genuisse natura magna* (7.1).¹⁷ That gives the book a human orientation, which is in line with Pliny's overall concern with man in nature, including man's

¹³ I have adopted here the division as formulated by K. Sallmann, who is careful to note the occurrence of independent excurses and encyclopedic additions ("Plinius [1]," *Der Neue Pauly* vol. 9 [2000] col. 136). For other, compatible descriptions of the second part, Books 20–37, see, e.g., M. Grant, *Greek and Latin Authors, 800 B.C. – A.D. 1000* (New York: Wilson 1980) p. 345 and A. Locher, "The Structure of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*," in *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, his Sources and Influence*, ed. R. French and F. Greenaway (Totowa NJ: Barnes and Noble 1986) pp. 22–24.

¹⁴ Carrey (2003) p. 1. Especially influential are the works of Beagon *Roman Nature* (1992) and *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History Book 7* (2005). The latter is most useful in regard to texts 731–733, which are drawn from *NH* 7.

¹⁵ *NH* pref. 29. What we read is less than inspiring: "Just as if I (Pliny) do not know that even a woman wrote critically of Theophrastus, a man so great in eloquence that he acquired a divine name from it, and that from this (criticism) arose the proverb of choosing a tree for hanging (oneself)" (61B). According to Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* 1.93, the woman was a prostitute named Leontium (61A).

¹⁶ See the "Index of Theophrastean Texts" in vol. 2 of the text-translation vols. pp. 681–683.

¹⁷ Whether *magna* is to be read with *natura*, or with what follows, or deleted is problematic, but it does not affect the emphasis placed on mankind.

cultural achievements in various aspects of human life.¹⁸ It also provides reason for the concluding sections of the book, in which we encounter a catalogue of inventors and inventions (191–209) followed by a list of three tacit agreements among all nations (210–213). Nevertheless, the way in which Pliny transitions from the preceding sections to the catalogue of inventions—*consentaneum videtur, priusquam digrediamur a natura hominum, indicare quae cuiusque inventa sint*, “It seems appropriate, before leaving the subject of human nature, to point out what was discovered by whom” (7.191)—suggests a loosely attached appendix. Similarly the list of three agreements may be seen as a second add-on. To be sure, the list of agreements begins with an explicit reference to the first agreement, the consensus *primus* (7.210), and that may be seen as a tie to the preceding catalogue of inventors and inventions (7.191–209), but the length of the list and the formal counting out of the “first, second (*re vera* subsequent) and third” agreements mark off the list from the preceding catalogue (7.191–209).¹⁹

Whatever one thinks of the final list, the preceding catalogue is not only loosely tied to what precedes but also itself loosely arranged. Beginning the catalogue with buying and selling seems odd and has little relationship to what follows: harvesting grapes, the diadem, crown and triumph, corn and grinding, and the introduction of legislation (191). That is a mixed bag, which acquires a measure of unity by focusing on gods as providers. But that too involves oddity, for the opening transitional sentence refers to man’s nature and to inventors (quoted above), which suggests that the focus will be on human beings as against gods. It might be objected that we are dealing here with inventions and inventors, and that loose arrangement is typical of the literature that catalogues inventions. Fair enough, but that prompts the question, whether Pliny’s catalogue has been taken over from existing invention literature and appended at the end of Book 7 without careful reworking. A positive answer is most likely correct. I cite the very

¹⁸ Beagon (2005) p. 416.

¹⁹ The fact that the report of the third agreement (7.212) refers to Book 2 (i.e., 2.187) indicates that Pliny took account of earlier material and in this way integrated the list into the larger work, but it hardly proves that the list of three agreements was originally part of (or followed immediately upon) the preceding catalogue of inventors and inventions. Furthermore, the fact that the list ends with a transitional statement announcing the subsequent discussion of living creatures other than men (214 *ad fin.*) shows only that Pliny wished to signal a change in focus. The sentence is detachable from what precedes and is correctly printed as a separate paragraph in the Teubner, Loeb and Budé editions as well as in Beagon’s translation. The same is true of the opening sentence of Book 8. It is similar in wording and is printed as a separate paragraph in the editions.

next section, in which the focus becomes the alphabet. We are told that additional letters were added to an original sixteen. Two sets of additional letters are given, $\text{HY}\Phi\text{X}$ and $\Psi\Xi\Omega\Theta$, but the primary sixteen are not. We also read of an original eighteen and two additional letters, ΦX , but again the letters that make up the original list are not given. My guess is that Pliny has drawn on an abbreviated version of a fuller account in which the missing sixteen and eighteen letters appeared (cf. 735, in which an original sixteen letters are given followed by two sets of four additional letters, making a total of 24). Pliny might have made an effort to add the original sixteen and eighteen letters (drawing on other passages collected in his notebooks), but he was not interested in improving the list. Similarly when we read that according to Theophrastus Polygnotus introduced painting in Greece (7.205 = 733), Pliny might have corrected the passage, either the reference to Theophrastus *qua* source or the accomplishment with which Polygnotus is credited (Pliny's remarks in 35.58 make clear that Polygnotus made improvements and was not the first to introduce painting in Greece), but Pliny seems not to have been interested in correcting an obvious error.²⁰ That may or may not be speculation, but either way I am comfortable in suggesting that the closing sections of Book 7 are drawn from elsewhere and appended without serious revision.

The preceding remarks are no more than an introduction to Pliny the Elder as a source for information concerning Theophrastus. My remarks have largely focused on the discussion of the final sections of Book 7, for it is there that texts 731–733 occur. The reader who wants to develop a more complete picture of Pliny *qua* source for Theophrastus might begin with Pliny's reports concerning Theophrastus' *Research on Plants*, for the Greek text of this work has come down to us and therefore can be compared with what Pliny says. Moreover, Pliny himself was clearly interested in plants: two-fifths of his work is devoted to plants—Books 12–19 focus on botany and Books 20–27 on pharmacology, i.e., medicinal plants—and in listing his sources for these books, Pliny assigns Theophrastus pride of place among foreign sources nine times (Bk 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27). Six times, Theophrastus is placed second (Bk 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20) and once third (Bk 16).²¹ That is hardly

²⁰ I am not suggesting that the later passage, 35.58, is entirely free from error. There Polynotus is said to be an Athenian, which is false or at least misleading. See below Chapter IV "The Texts" on 733.

²¹ A. Morton, "Pliny on Plants: His Place in the History of Botany," in *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, his Sources and Influence*, ed. R. French and F. Greenaway

surprising, for Pliny was a knowledgeable person and as such recognized Theophrastus' unmatched contribution to the study of plants. That said, Pliny's citations of Theophrastus cannot be accepted uncritically. There are omissions, additions, changes in order and outright confusion. For example, omission occurs at *NH* 26.99 = 413 no. 110, where Pliny names Theophrastus in regard to a plant whose alleged potency as an aphrodisiac is said to be extraordinary. The Theophrastean text in question is *Research on Plants* 9.18.9. There Theophrastus expresses doubt, albeit succinctly ("if true").²² Pliny ignores the qualifier, which may seem unimportant, but his motivation may be self-serving. By ignoring Theophrastus, Pliny directs the reader's full attention to his own expression of doubt.²³ Addition and reordering occur together in *NH* 13.101–102 = 413 no. 52. There Pliny, who has been discussing tables made of citrus wood, tells us that the wood was known to Homer²⁴ and that Theophrastus valued the wood highly. The Theophrastean passage in question is *Research on Plants* 5.3.7. The material has been reordered, so that the wood's use in building now comes before the places in which it grows, and material has been added in that roofing is now mentioned along side flooring.²⁵ Confusion is present in *NH* 27.63 = 413 no. 32, where Pliny says that Theophrastus wants the *crataegos* or *crataegona* to be understood

(Totowa: Barnes and Noble 1986) pp. 86–97. Morton errs in reporting the number of times that Theophrastus enjoys pride of place in the lists of foreign sources for Books 12–27. Whereas Morton reports ten occurrences, the number is actually nine. He seems to have misread the list of foreign sources for Book 16, in which Theophrastus comes third.

²² Amigues vol. 5 pp. 227–228 compares *Research on Plants* 9.15.2 and 9.17.4.

²³ G.E.R. Lloyd, *Science, Folklore and Ideology* (Cambridge: University Press 1983) pp. 146–147 and Sharples (1995) p. 182.

²⁴ The Greek name is Θύσος; *Odyssey* 5.60.

²⁵ In *NH* 13.101, Pliny gives a date for Theophrastus' writing: 440 years after the founding of Rome (i.e., 314 B.C.). From the way Pliny expresses himself, it seems that he is offering an approximate date that relates closely to the death of Alexander the Great and the subsequent ascendance of Theophrastus to the headship of the Peripatos. The relevant portion of the Latin text runs: *Theophrastus, qui proximus a Magni Alexandri aetate scripsit circa urbis Romanae annum ccccxccc*. A similar impression is given by Pliny's wording in 15.1 = 413 no. 59: *urbis Romae anno circiter ccccxl*. At 19.32 = 413 no. 4 = 408, Pliny again refers to the founding of Rome but now without a qualifying "about." At 3.58 = 413 no. 55 = 599, Pliny yet again mentions the founding of Rome, but this time he includes a reference to the archonship of Nicodorus at Athens. He was archon in 314–313 BC. See Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History* 19.66 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dinarchus* 9. Caveat: in the latter passage, we are offered a list of archons, in which Nicodorus is followed by a Theophrastus, who is not the Peripatetic but rather the archon of 413–412. Nicodorus is mentioned by Theophrastus in *Explanations of Plants* 1.19.5.

as the tree called *aequifolium* in Italy, i.e., the holly. That is not true. In *Research on Plants* 3.15.6, the tree described by Theophrastus is a type of thorn.²⁶

The preceding cases of error and distortion should be sufficient to encourage caution when dealing with Pliny's reports concerning *Research on Plants*. In conclusion, I call attention to one more text, for it not only encourages caution but also suggests that Pliny may not be to blame for all the changes that occur in his reports. The text that I have in mind is *Natural History* 19.32 = 408 = 413 no. 84, in which Pliny refers to Theophrastus who is said to speak of a particular kind of bulb that grows around river-banks and has a woolly substance between its outermost skin and the edible portion within. From this woolly substance, shoes and certain garments are made. Pliny then comments that Theophrastus does not record the region in which this occurs,²⁷ nor does he say anything in greater detail except that the plant in question is called wool-bearer, *eriophoron*. To this Pliny adds "at least in the copies that I have found," *in exemplaribus quae eundem invenerim* (19.32 = 408.5–6). Pliny is referring to *Research on Plants* 7.13.8, and his report contains one noteworthy error. Whereas Theophrastus says that the wool-bearer grows at the seashore, i.e., along the coasts, ἐν αἰγιαλοῖς, Pliny says that it grows around the banks of rivers, *circa ripas amnium*. But that is not what interests me. Rather, it is the qualifying remark concerning copies of the Theophrastean work that Pliny claims to have found. I take him at his word²⁸ and conclude that on occasion²⁹ Pliny was

²⁶ See the notes of, e.g., W. Jones in the Loeb edition of Pliny's *Natural History* (1956) vol. 7 p. 428 and A. Ernout in the Budé edition (1959) vol. 27 p. 90.

²⁷ The assertion that Theophrastus does not record "the region in which this occurs" might seem odd, for Pliny has just said that the bulb in question grows around the banks of rivers, and we can imagine that the production of slippers and garments dependent upon the plant occurs nearby. But perhaps Pliny is looking for a reference to a particular country or geographical area.

²⁸ I am agreeing with Regenbogen col. 1441.

²⁹ I have expressed myself carefully, because on the basis of a single reference to copies of the *NH*, we cannot conclude that Pliny regularly, let alone always, consulted the Theophrastean work directly and not through an intermediary that makes reference to Theophrastus. For similar caution, see J. Scarborough, "Pharmacy in Pliny's *Natural History*: Some Observations on Substances and Sources" in *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, His Sources and Influence*, ed. R. French and F. Greenaway (Totowa NJ: Barnes and Noble 1986) p. 86, 76. For more detailed discussion, see Regenbogen col. 1440–1442, who concludes that there are passages concerning which Pliny did consult Theophrastus directly, but that there are extensive portions of Theophrastus' writings on plants, where Pliny is dependent on intermediate sources, whether these be other authors or a more conveniently arranged epitome of Theophrastus' writings (col. 1441).

prepared to make an effort to check his source and that more than one copy of Theophrastus' work was in circulation when Pliny wrote his *Natural History*. Moreover, Pliny believed that different copies might contain different or fuller readings. And if that belief is correct, we should not be hasty to condemn Pliny or any other author, who offers a report which is not entirely in line with our text of *Research on Plants*. The report could be an accurate reflection of what was written in the copy available to Pliny or whomever.³⁰

3 Plutarch] c. 46–120 AD

Plutarch hailed from Chaeronea in Boeotia, studied in Athens, traveled extensively, visited Rome on several occasions, was a copious reader, wrote on numerous topics and became a priest of the god Apollo at Delphi. The surviving works are divided into the Parallel Lives and the Moralia. The former are paired biographies, one Greek and one Roman, which exhibit a strong interest in moral character. The latter are diverse in subject and form. In addition to ethics and religion, the topics include *inter alia* politics, science, psychology, rhetoric and poetics.³¹ The so-called Lamprias catalogue, a list of Plutarch's writings dating from the third or fourth century AD, makes clear that the surviving corpus is not complete.

Plutarch's knowledge of earlier Greek writers is impressive.³² That includes his knowledge of Theophrastus. Indeed, sixty-seven Plutarchan texts are included in the text-translation volumes: some are printed as numbered texts, others are cited in the apparatus of parallel texts and still others are mentioned in a list.³³ Our particular concern is with a work conventionally referred to by the Latin title *Quaestiones Graecae* and in English by *Greek Questions*. In the text-translation volumes, we have used the conventional

³⁰ The manuscript tradition of *Research on Plants* is complicated and in places faulty, so that a later author who cites the Theophrastean work in a way that diverges from our received text need not be misreporting the text that was available to him. Indeed, on occasion he may preserve a better reading. See, e.g., S. Amigues, who in the Budé edition vol. 5 p. 212 n. 6, corrects the text of 9.17.3 on the basis of what the paradoxographer Apollonius reports (*Amazing Stories* 50). For brief discussion, see my article "Apollonius on Theophrastus on Aristoxenus," in *Aristoxenos of Tarentum* (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2012) = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 17 pp. 159–161.

³¹ For a survey of the topics covered by Plutarch, see Ziegler col. 66–71.

³² See Ziegler col. 277–289.

³³ The numbered texts printed under "Ethics" are listed in *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) p. 36 n. 79 and discussed in later parts of the commentary. The numbered texts printed under "Rhetoric and Poetics" are discussed in *Commentary* 8 (2005) pp. 337–346, 377–394.

titles and I shall not hesitate to use them in what follows. Nevertheless, we should take note of Plutarch's own title for the work, namely Αἵτια Ἑλληνικά. This title invites comparison with two other works of Plutarch, Αἵτια Ῥωμαϊκά and Αἵτια βαρβαρικά, conventionally referred to as *Roman Questions* and *Barbarian Questions*.³⁴ The latter work has been lost, but the former survives and is like *Greek Questions* in that it contains various questions, each of which is followed by an answer or explanation. The two works differ, however, in that *Roman Questions* is longer and addresses more questions (113 as against 59), each of which is introduced with the formulaic phrase διὰ τί, "for what reason" and many of which are answered in more than one way.³⁵ The formula πότερον ... ἢ is used frequently in order to mark off alternative answers, as it is in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*. In *Greek Questions*, the phrase διὰ τί does occur but only 14 times.³⁶ Some answers involve alternatives, and the phrase πότερον ... ἢ is used, but only infrequently.³⁷ Both works exhibit little interest in arranging the questions in a coherent order. That gives the impression of being collections of material for use on later occasions and for a variety of purposes. That said, it should be noted that Ziegler sees deliberate diversity, ποικιλία, in the lack of coherent order.³⁸ That is not impossible. Aelian claims to have embraced lack of order as a way of keeping the reader's interest while avoiding boredom (*On the Nature of Animals*, epilogue p. 435.4–18 Hercher), but that does not tell us what Plutarch intended when he composed *Greek Questions*. It should also be noted that Ziegler calls attention to the *Life of Romulus* (15.7) and the *Life of Camillus* (19.12), in which Plutarch refers to the *Roman Questions*.³⁹ That suggests strongly that Plutarch himself had prepared and actually published *Roman Questions*.⁴⁰ And if we assume that Plutarch was equally interested in *Greek Questions*, then we might conclude that both *Roman and Greek Questions* were published, but that seems to me risky. Ziegler tells us that the *Life of*

³⁴ In the Lamprias catalogue, *Roman Questions* and *Barbarian Questions* occur together as no. 138 and 139, while *Greek Questions* occurs later as no. 166, albeit with minor variations. All three titles have Αἵτια instead of Αἵτια, and in the third title, Ἑλλήνων occurs instead of Ἑλληνικά.

³⁵ In order to mark off alternative answers, frequent use is made of the formula πότερον ... ἢ, which is common in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*.

³⁶ Questions 31, 36–37, 39, 45–51, 53, 55, 58.

³⁷ Questions 36, 39 and 54.

³⁸ Ziegler col. 225.

³⁹ *Life of Romulus* 15.7 refers to *Roman Questions* 87 285B–D (Ziegler col. 223 errs in citing 29 271D), and *Life of Camillus* 19.12 refers to 25 269E–270D.

⁴⁰ See Ziegler col. 223; he is opposing Halliday p. 13 and J. Titchener, introductory note to the Teubner edition of *Roman Questions* (1971) vol. 2 p. 274.

Theseus 16 shows a use of *Greek Questions* 35. To be sure, there is a connection: both works mention the chant of the Bottiaen maidens, “Let us go to Athens” (16.3 and 35 298E–299A). But the *Life of Theseus* does not refer to *Greek Questions*. Rather, it cites Aristotle’s *Constitution of the Bottiaens* as the source of what is reported (16.2). I prefer to suspend judgment concerning the publication of *Greek Questions*. Much may depend on what counts as publication.⁴¹

Twice in *Greek Questions*, Plutarch refers to Theophrastus. On the first occasion (7 292C–D = 192), he asks, “What are the floating clouds?” and answers that people used “floating clouds” to refer to clouds that are full of rain and move around. In support of this answer, Plutarch cites verbatim, κατὰ λέξιν,⁴² three lines from the fourth book of Theophrastus’ Περὶ μεταρσιῶν, in which mobile rainclouds and white stationary clouds are said to differ in their matter. The title Περὶ μεταρσιῶν appears in Diogenes catalogue as Μεταρσιολογικῶν α'β' (5.44 = 1.134 = 137 no. 15a).⁴³ The word μετάρσια is Ionic, and according to Capelle and others it is used by Theophrastus to pick out phenomena belonging to the atmosphere as against the μετέωρα, which belong to the heavens.⁴⁴ The reference to four books is problematic in that Diogenes’ catalogue has two books. Perhaps Plutarch has erred or his number reflects combining two works: A work *On Metarsiology* in one book with *On Waters* in three books (Diogenes Laertius 5.45 = 1.163 = 137 no. 18b). See Sharples, Commentary 3.1 (1998) pp. 159–160.

Plutarch also refers to Theophrastus, when answering the question, “What is the source of the proverbial saying, ‘This is valid?’” (42 301C = 624). The answer focuses on Deinon of Tarentum, who held the office of general

⁴¹ Ziegler col. 223 observes that *Roman Questions* lacks an introduction and a conclusion, which reinforces the impression of a simple collection of material. But he also argues that a modicum of order and style suggests that the work was something more than a mere *Materialsammlung*. *Greek Questions*, too, has no introduction and no conclusion, and lacking certain features possessed by *Roman Questions*, e.g., the unbroken repetition of διὰ τί, it seems all the more a simple collection of interesting problems. Or is variation in the interrogative word or phrase a prophylactic against boredom?

⁴² On the phrase κατὰ λέξιν, see LSJ s.v. λέξις citing Plutarch, *On the Malice of Herodotus* 38 86gD.

⁴³ In the text-translation volumes, we have translated Μεταρσιολογικῶν α'β' with *Meteorology*, 2 books and not with *Metarsiology*. That is quite acceptable, for in everyday English “meteorology” is often (if not most often) understood to be concerned with atmospheric phenomena (everybody’s favorite meteorologist is the weatherman) and not those of the heavens, i.e., stars and the like, which fall under astronomy.

⁴⁴ Capelle, W. “Zur Geschichte der meteorologischen Literatur,” *Hermes* 48 (1913) p. 333 n. 3, Regenbogen col. 1408, Halliday p. 54, Sharples (1998) p. 17 n. 56.

and was skilled in military matters. When a motion of his was rejected by a show of hands in the democratic assembly, he raised his right hand and asserted that his motion had the better votes. See Chapter IV “The Texts” on 624 p. 231–232.

4 Harpocraton] 2nd century AD

Valerius Harpocraton was a Greek grammarian of Alexandria. He belongs to the second century AD⁴⁵ and wrote at least two works: one entitled Ἀνθη-
ρων συναγωγή, *Collection of Florid Expressions*, which has been lost, and a second entitled Λέξεις τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων, *Lexicon of the Ten Orators*, i.e., of the ten Athenian orators, whose canonical status had been established in Alexandria by Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus of Samothrace during the early second century BC. The *Lexicon* is an early example of strict alphabetization (as in a modern dictionary), but there are places where the principle is not fully applied and places that have been disturbed in transmission. The entries total 1247: the largest number begin with alpha (281), the least with psi (3), while omega is not represented.⁴⁶ Most likely a significant number of entries have been lost. The *Lexicon* survives in two forms: an epitome that was made before 850AD and a longer version of which no manuscript is older than 1300AD. In the text-translation volumes, we cite the edition of Dindorf, which dates from the mid-nineteenth century. There is now a new edition by Keaney (1991), but it must be used with some caution. Citing the criticism of Otranto, Dickey says that the edition is “too full of errors to be used by itself.”⁴⁷

The *Lexicon* contains much information that is otherwise lost to us, and that includes reports concerning Theophrastus. In the text-translation volumes, twenty-two different reports are printed or referred to. Seventeen will be found in the section on “Politics” (627, 632, 633, 635, 636C, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 647, 649, 651, 653, 656, 657, 658), which is not surprising given that Harpocraton’s *Lexicon* is concerned with words and phrases found in Athenian orators. Two occur under “Particular Plants” (413 no. 86 and 413 no. 48) and one each under Testamentary Matters (35), Metals (201) and Proverbs (737). Our special concern in the present commentary is with the last of

⁴⁵ See R. Tosi, “Harpocraton 2” in *Brills New Pauly* vol. 5 (2004) col. 1151.

⁴⁶ See J. Keaney, “Alphabetization in Harpocraton’s *Lexicon*,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 14 (1973) pp. 416–417, who recognizes that the total may need to be corrected.

⁴⁷ Dickey p. 94, citing R. Otranto’s review of Keaney in *Quaderni di storia* 38 (1993) pp. 225–244.

these reports, i.e. 737, which begins with the lemma ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείκνυσι, “Rule reveals the man.” In what follows, Harpocration refers these words to Demosthenes (one of the canonical Ten) and specifies a work, namely, *Political Exordia*. Within that work, the relevant chapter is no. 48, in which the orator refers to the saying quite generally as that which is said: τοῦτ’ εἰρημένον. Next Harpocration introduces Sophocles, who refers the saying to Solon, and finally he mentions Theophrastus and Aristotle who refer the saying to Bias. Theophrastus is mentioned first, and reference is made to his work *On Proverbs*. In Photius’ *Lexicon* (9th century) and in the *Suda* (10th century), “Rule reveals the man” again occurs as a lemma followed by brief explanation. Demosthenes is omitted (neither work is focused specifically on the canonical orators), but Solon is mentioned as is the attribution to Bias by Aristotle and Theophrastus. Now Aristotle has pride of place, and no Theophrastean work is named.⁴⁸ For further discussion of 737 see below Chapter IV “The Texts,” the section on “Proverbs” p. 211–215.

5 Anonymous on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*] end 2nd century AD

At the end of the text-translation volumes in the “Index of Theophrastean Texts” (vol. 2 p. 635), the date assigned to the Anonymous is the twelfth century AD. That is an error, which arose from the fact that the Anonymous’ commentary on Books 2–5 of the *Nicomachean Ethics* have come down to us as part of a composite commentary that covers the entire *Nicomachean Ethics* and dates to the twelfth century. The commentary on Books 2–5 is much earlier dating to the late second century. The latest persons to whom the Anonymous refers are the satirist Lucian (120–180 AD) and the middle Platonist Atticus, who was active under Marcus Aurelius (emperor 161–180 AD).

The Anonymous was a compiler of scholia, which go back to a variety of sources including Aspasius, whose commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* dates to the first half of the second century. Another source will have been Adrastus, who was a Peripatetic philosopher and like Aspasius lived in the first half of the second century. His writings included a commentary on Plato’s *Timaeus* and several works on Aristotle. Given our interest in Theophrastus, especially important is Adrastus’ work in six books or rolls, of which five are said to have dealt with questions of history and style in Theophrastus’ *On Dispositions* (436 no. 1) and one (the sixth book) with the

⁴⁸ Photius, *Lexicon* α 2929 vol. 1 p. 270.6–8 Theodoridis and *Suda* α 4096 vol. 1 p. 374.1–21 Adler.

same matters in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 15.15 673E–F = 437).⁴⁹ According to Paul Moraux, the philological, literary and historical scholia in the collection of the Anonymous are of high quality and may be attributed to Adrastus.⁵⁰

In the text-translation volumes, there are three texts, in which the Anonymous refers by name to Theophrastus. One of these texts is a scholium on *Nicomachean Ethics* 4.2 (4.1 OCT⁵¹) 1121a7. It begins with the lemma “And (the generous person) is not pleasing to Simonides.” The subsequent comment tells us that other persons speak of Simonides as fond of money, as Theophrastus does in his *On Dispositions* and in his *On Wealth* (516). The reference to *On Dispositions* suggests that the comment goes back to Adrastus, who wrote five books on the work. The reference to *On Wealth* (436 no. 19a) may have the same or a different source. For discussion, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 503–505. A second text concerns *Ethics* 5.3 (5.1 OCT) 1129b29–30 and has as its lemma “And we say by way of proverb.” In his comment, the Anonymous refers to Theophrastus, citing both *On Dispositions* and *Ethics*. Again the mention of *On Dispositions* suggests that the Anonymous is drawing on Adrastus, who may or may not have referred to the *Ethics* (436 no. 2). For discussion, see below, Chapter 4 “The Texts,” Section 2 pp. 207–211. The third text concerns *Ethics* 5.10 (5.8 OCT) 1135b11–19, where Aristotle speaks of injuries due to ignorance, which he divides into misfortunes and mistakes. The Anonymous comments that Theophrastus does not subsume misfortunes under unjust acts, and Aristotle does not seem to do so either (530). Here there is no mention of *On Dispositions* or any other Theophrastean writing. For discussion, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 547–550.

6 Clement of Alexandria] c. 150–215 AD

Titus Flavius Clemens was born a pagan in either Athens or Alexandria. We do not know when he converted to Christianity. What we do know is that

⁴⁹ The text runs: πάντες μὲν βιβλία Περὶ τῶν παρὰ Θεοφράστῳ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ ἡθῶν καθ' ἱστορίαν καὶ λέξιν ζητούμενων, ἔκτον δὲ Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς Ἠθικοῖς Νικομαχείοις Ἀριστοτέλους (437.2–5).

⁵⁰ Moraux (1984) pp. 323–329. Cf. H. Mercken, “The Greek Commentators on Aristotle's *Ethics*” in *Aristotle Transformed*, ed. R. Sorabji (London: Duckworth 1990) p. 422.

⁵¹ As in my *Commentaries* on ethics and rhetoric-poetics, 6.1 and 9, I normally refer to Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* by means of the numbers found in the Oxford Classical Text. However, in the text-translation volumes, we used the Bekker numbers when referring to the Aristotelian commentators. For that reason I give both in headings and occasionally in the body of a comment as here.

he traveled widely through Italy, Syria and Palestine until 180 AD, when he settled in Alexandria. There he joined Pantaenus in a catechetical school, in which he taught until 202–203, when the persecution of Christians under Severus caused him to leave Alexandria for Cappadocia. He died c. 215, never having returned to Alexandria.

Clement was well versed not only in the Bible but also in pagan literature. Cyril describes him as an expert in Greek history (*Against Julian* 6.215), and Jerome calls attention to his knowledge of secular literature (*On Distinguished Men* 38).⁵² Clement viewed positively much of Greek literature, seeing it as an anticipation of the truth revealed in Christ. His view of popular Greek religion was very different. Its mysteries, legends, and ceremonies were strongly criticized in the work entitled *Exhortation to the Greeks*.

In addition to *Exhortation*, Clement's extant writings include *Tutor*, *Patchwork* and *Who is the Rich Man That is Being Saved*. In these works, Theophrastus is named seven times: once in *Exhortation* and six times in *Patchwork*. In *Exhortation* we read: ὁ δὲ Ἑρέσιος ἐκεῖνος Θεόφραστος ὁ Ἀριστοτέλους γνώριμος πῇ μὲν οὐρανόν, πῇ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸν θεὸν ὑπονοεῖ, "And the well-known man from Eresus, Theophrastus the student/associate of Aristotle, supposes in one place that god is the heaven and in another that he is spirit" (5.66.5 = 252B). There is here an assertion of inconsistency in Theophrastus' statements concerning the divinity. In that regard, Clement's words echo a passage in Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods*, in which we read: *nec vero Theophrasti inconstantia ferenda est; modo enim menti divinum tribuit principatum, modo caelo, tum autem signis sideribusque caelestibus*, "Nor indeed is the fickleness of Theophrastus to be tolerated, for sometimes he assigned divine primacy to mind, sometimes to the heaven, at another time, however, to the heavenly signs and the stars" (1.35 = 252A). If one reads *divinae* instead of *divinum* (see the *apparatus criticus*), then the translation is "he assigned primacy to the divine mind." Most likely both Clement and Cicero are drawing on a secondary source, and if different sources, then closely related sources. Both authors report inconsistency, and *caelum* may be regarded as the Latin equivalent of οὐρανός. But there are problems. I mention one that is hard to overlook: namely, the occurrence of πνεῦμα in Clement's text. Given *mens* in Cicero, we might expect νοῦς in Clement.

⁵² According Ferguson p. 4, Clement cites 348 secular or pagan writers, though he is careful to add that he will have known some only through anthologies and compendia. According to G. Butterworth, *Clement of Alexandria* = Loeb vol. 92 (1919, repr. Cambridge MA: Harvard 1982) p. xiii, Clement names more than 300 ancients, of whom we otherwise know nothing.

Moreover, Theophrastus followed Aristotle in holding that νοῦς is separable and immaterial.⁵³ To identify it with or to explain it in terms of πνεῦμα is not Theophrastean. Apparently Clement's report is faulty, and as Pötscher suggests, the fault most likely lies with Clement himself. His Christian mind-set has caused him to introduce the notion of "spirit," πνεῦμα, as we meet it in the *New Testament*.⁵⁴ Stoic doctrine, too, may have had some influence, for the Stoics were materialists who explained mind and soul in terms of warm connate πνεῦμα.⁵⁵ And if that is correct, text 252B can serve as a warning. Even source-authors who are known to be well-read in Greek literature may introduce an inappropriate word or expression (perhaps quite unconsciously) and in doing so create a report that is misleading or simply wrong.

A different example of Clement misrepresenting Theophrastus is found in Book 3 of *Patchwork*. After stating that Pythagoreans marry in order to procreate (3.3 24.1), he tells us that the Pythagoreans ban the eating of beans, not because they result in belching, indigestion and nightmares. Nor is the ban imposed because beans have the shape of a human head. Rather they ban beans because they produce sterility in women (3.3 24.2). That prompts a reference to Book 5 of Theophrastus' work *Plant Explanations*, in which Theophrastus is said to report that bean-pods put round the roots of young trees cause the trees to dry up, and that birds that eat bean-pods over a period of time become infertile (3.3 24.3 = 384 no. 2c, 417 no. 15). At first reading, the remarks concerning Theophrastus seem unproblematic. After focusing on the effect of beans on women, Clement adds a quasi-footnote or addendum that underlines the bad effects of beans: first on young trees and then on birds. The latter effect is the same as that on women, i.e., sterility, so that citing Theophrastus creates a mini-ring composition (sterility—drying up—sterility), which seems entirely apposite. But there is a problem. In *Plant Explanations*, Theophrastus makes no reference to birds that become infertile. He speaks only of the drying effect that results from scattering bean pods on the roots of trees (5.15.1). The unsuspecting reader might think that Clement has preserved a choice morsel (the effect on birds), which has fallen out of our version of *Plant Explanations*, and that Clement is owed a debt of gratitude for increasing our knowledge of Theophrastus, albeit ever so

⁵³ See 271, 307A, 322A, 323A–B, 483–485 with Commentary 6.1 (2011) pp. 253–255, 397–408.

⁵⁴ See Pötscher p. 86, who cites *Matthew* 29.19 and *Acts* 2.4.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., Arius' summary of Stoic ethics in Stobaeus, *Anthology* 2.7.5b7 p. 64.21–23 Wachsmuth together with A. Long and D. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* vol. 1 p. 320 on text 53G1–5.

little. But that would be a mistake. Clement has not consulted Theophrastus directly. Rather, he is drawing on Apollonius the paradoxographer, who first cites Theophrastus concerning trees and then adds, apparently on his own, the report concerning birds (*Amazing Stories* 46 [p. 140.251–254 Giannini] = 417 no. 15).⁵⁶ That may enhance the wonder that Apollonius' reader experiences, but it also misleads the incautious reader. Clement is an example.

The other five passages in Patchwork that name Theophrastus are 1.14 63.5 = 11 no. 5: Theophrastus is named as the successor of Aristotle; 1.16 77.1 = 728: Theophrastus recorded various inventions; 2.2 9.5 = 301B: Theophrastus is reported to have recognized sense as the starting point of conviction; 6.7 57.3 = 10 no. 9 and 6.18 167.2 = 10 no. 10: Theophrastus is named as a student of Aristotle. In the text-translation volumes, text 728 is printed among the "Miscellaneous Items." It is commented on below in Chapter IV "The Texts."

7 Athenaeus] fl. c. 200 AD

Athenaeus was born in Naucratis, Egypt⁵⁷ but lived and worked most of this life in Rome. There he enjoyed the patronage of P. Livius Larensius, a Roman official, who is also the host of the banquet that is described in Athenaeus' Δειπνοσοφίσται, *The Sophists at Dinner*.⁵⁸ Larensius possessed a large personal library, which will have been an invaluable resource when Athenaeus wrote *The Sophists at Dinner*.⁵⁹ At least two other works were written by Athenaeus. Both are lost, and both are referred to in *The Sophists at Dinner*. One carried the title Περί τῶν ἐν Συρίᾳ βασιλευσάντων, *On Those*

⁵⁶ Fortenbaugh, "Apollonius on Theophrastus on Aristoxenus," in *Aristoxenus of Tarentum*, ed. C. Huffman = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 17 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2012a) p. 172.

⁵⁷ See the *Suda* s.v. Athenaeus = *Lexicographi Graeci* vol. 1 part 1 p. 69.17–18 (alpha no. 731), where we read that Athenaeus lived under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (161–180 BC). That date appears to be too early for the composition of *The Sophists at Dinner*. See below.

⁵⁸ The most recent translator of Athenaeus' work, S.D. Olson, translates the title with *The Learned Banqueters* (the Loeb edition 2006).

⁵⁹ In *The Sophists at Dinner* 1.4 3A–B, we are told that Larensius possessed such a large number of old Greek books that he surpassed all those who possessed marvelous collections. A list of renowned collectors follows beginning with Polycrates the tyrant of Samos and ending with the three Peripatetics, Aristotle, Theophrastus and Neleus. The last is said to have preserved the books of Aristotle and Theophrastus (40.1–7). According to Strabo, *Geography* 13.1.54, Neleus removed the libraries of Aristotle and Theophrastus to Scepsis, where the heirs of Neleus kept the books shut up and carelessly stored, even hidden in the ground, so that members of the Peripatos were almost entirely without books (37.1–20). As reported, the story is not to be believed. See *Commentary* 8 (2005) p. 28, 51–52 n. 12.

Who Ruled in Syria (5.47 211A).⁶⁰ The other was a monograph on the *Fishes*, a play by Archippus, a poet of Middle Comedy (7.138 329C = CAF fr. 27 vol. 2 p. 684 Kock = PCG fr. 27 vol. 2 p. 547 Kassel-Austin).⁶¹

Only a rough date for the composition of *The Sophists at Dinner* is possible. A date *post quem*, 192AD, is suggested by a hostile reference to the Emperor Commodus (12.53 537F). Before his death in 192, a hostile reference would be dangerous and therefore unlikely.⁶² That said, it would be a mistake to think that the death of Commodus gives us a date *post quem* for the entire work. The very length and complexity of *The Sophists at Dinner* tells us that the work was written over a significant period of time. Book 12 in which the reference to Commodus appears will not have been written first, and no matter when it was written, a later addition would be possible. It has been thought that one of the dramatic figures, i.e., a banqueter within *The Sophists at Dinner*, might be helpful in dating the work. He is Ulpian of Tyre (1.2 1D), whose death is mentioned late in the work (15.33 686C). If this Ulpian is the well-known jurist Domitius Ulpianus, then the work will not have been completed before 228, when the jurist died. But identifying the dramatic figure with the famous jurist is something of a stretch. The former is said to have died peacefully; the latter was appointed praetorian prefect by Severus Alexander and died a violent death at the hands of his troops.⁶³ What we can say with confidence is that Athanaeus and Claudius Aelianus (c. 170–235AD) were contemporaries. Both lived and worked in Rome, and both made abundant use of secondary sources. In the case of Theophrastus, we possess texts that show the two reporting the same material, which is taken almost certainly from the same intermediary.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ In *The Sophists at Dinner* at 5.47 211A, Athenaeus makes the banqueter Masurius refer to the author of *On Those Who Ruled in Syria* as “our comrade Athenaeus.” There can be no reasonable doubt that the reference is to Athenaeus of Naucratis, i.e., the author of the *Sophists at Dinner*. Before beginning his account of the banquet, Athenaeus states clearly that he was present at the banquet (1.3 2A). In Jacoby *FGrH*, the text is 166 F 1. Concerning the work *On those who ruled in Syria*, see D. Braund, “Athenaeus, *On the Kings of Syria*,” in *Athenaeus and His World*, ed. D. Braund and J. Wilkins (Exeter: University Press 2000) pp. 514–522.

⁶¹ For the fragments of the *Fishes* of Archippus, see CAF fr. 14–33 vol. 2 pp. 681–686 Kock = PCG fr. 14–34 vol. 2 pp. 542–549 Kassel-Austin. For discussion, see J. Wilkins “Athenaeus and the *Fishes* of Archippus” in *Athenaeus and his World* pp. 523–535.

⁶² Commodus’ reign as Emperor (180–192AD) was marked by tense relations with the Senate, many of whose members were executed. Commodus himself was strangled in his bath by the wrestler Narcissus after an attempt to poison him failed.

⁶³ See D. Braund, “General Introduction” in *Athenaeus and His World* p. 17 and Olson op. cit. pp. xi–ii.

⁶⁴ I am referring to 552A–B, 567A–B and 579A–B. See *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 59–60 with n. 184.

The Sophists at Dinner runs for fifteen books. It was once believed that the book ran for thirty books, but that idea has been refuted.⁶⁵ The primary manuscript is codex Venetus Marcianus 447, which belongs to the ninth or early tenth century; other manuscripts are dependent upon it. Books 1–2 and portions of 3, 11 and 15 are not found in the primary manuscript and therefore are absent in the dependent manuscripts. There is, however, an epitome, which survives in several manuscripts, of which the best are codex Parisinus suppl. Graecus 841 and codex Laurentianus LX2. The epitome was compiled some centuries before the primary manuscript and is of considerable value not only because it contains the absent books in abbreviated form but also because it provides a check on the codex Marcianus. That said, it is well to keep in mind that the epitome has its own problems. The abbreviation is often disjointed and on occasion introduces mistakes that can be corrected by reference to the codex Marcianus. An example is found in Book four where the epitomist refers three times to Theophrastus (4.25 144E–145A). The second and third time the correct reference is to Theopompus, which is found in the codex Marcianus.⁶⁶ The epitomist appears to have been misled by the first occurrence, where Theophrastus is correct (144E = 603.1), and by the similarity of the two names, which invites confusion.

On occasion we may wonder whether the epitomist or Athenaeus has erred. I am thinking of a passage in Book 2, which tells us that Aristotle or Theophrastus records that a certain Philinus never consumed any food or drink other than plain milk throughout the whole of his life (2.2 44B–C = 340). At first reading that seems straightforward, and since we cannot check the text against the codex Marcianus in which Book 2 is missing, we are apt to accept the report as accurate. But that would be hasty, for the report seems to be based on a passage in Plutarch's *Table Talk*, in which Philinus is a dramatic character in the dialogue. A pupil of his is compared to a certain Sosastrus,⁶⁷ who is said to have lived on milk alone for his entire life (4.1 660E). Apparently someone has erred. It may be Athenaeus who has misunderstood his source, or perhaps he has used a faulty source, or perhaps the culprit is the epitomist who has introduced Aristotle and Theophrastus where they do not belong.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ See G. Arnott, "Athenaeus and the Epitome," in *Athenaeus and His World* pp. 42–43.

⁶⁶ S. Peppink, *Athenaei Deipnosophistarum epitome, pars prima, libri III–VIII* (Leiden: Brill 1937) pp. xxv, 24.

⁶⁷ The name Sosastrus has been doubted; Sostratus and Sosistratus have been conjectured. But neither is compelling. See the note of F. Fuhrmann in the Budé edition, *Plutarque: Propos de table, Livres IV–VI* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1978) p. 127.

⁶⁸ See R. Sharples' *Commentary* vol. 5 (1995) on biology pp. 18–20. For another example

In the passage just cited, the report concerning Philinus is attributed to Aristotle or Theophrastus. A concern with proper attribution is found elsewhere in regard to whole works that are referred to by title. One example is the *Memoranda* in six books, which Athenaeus describes as either Aristotelian or Theophrastean (4.74 173E = 587). On this work, see Chapter III "Titles of Books" pp. 86–89 on 727 no. 6. A second example is the work *On Pleasure*, which according to Athenaeus was attributed to both Theophrastus and Chamaeleon (6.105 273C = 550.5–6 and 8.39 347E = 553.2). On this work, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 209–210 on 436 no. 27b. Still a third example is *To Cassander on Kingship*. In this case, Athenaeus tells us that the work was attributed to both Theophrastus and Sosibius (4.25 144E = 603.2). See below, the introduction to Chapter III p. 71. The attention to disputed authorship is encouraging. Even if Athenaeus is following a source without reflection, he has at least reported the hesitation expressed by his source.

At the beginning of the present comment on Athenaeus, I made mention of the personal library of Larensius and said that it will have been an invaluable resource when Athenaeus wrote *The Sophists at Dinner*. Later I suggested that Theophrastus made use of intermediaries, i.e., secondary sources that offered reports concerning Theophrastus' writings. That may seem inconsistent. At very least one may wonder whether the library of Larensius was rich in Theophrastean material, and if so why Athenaeus would consult intermediaries. Concerning the possibility that Larensius' library contained significant Theophrastean material, we can only guess. A work like *On Drunkenness*, which Athenaeus cites on seven occasions (569.3, 570.2, 572.1, 573.1, 574.1, 575.1, 576.5) may well have been available and consulted directly by Theophrastus, but that need not be the norm. Scholars have suggested that Athenaeus got his Aristotle at second hand through intermediaries,⁶⁹ and I am inclined to believe that he got much of his Theophrastus from intermediaries, many of which are likely to have been available in Larensius' library.

from Book 2, see 413 no. 5–7 = 2.59–60 61F–62A with R. Sharples and D. Minter, "Theophrastus on Fungi, Inaccurate Citations in Athenaeus," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 103 (1983) pp. 154–156 and D. Gourevitch, "Hicesius' Fish and Chips" in *Athenaeus and His World* (Exeter: University Press 2000) pp. 484–485.

⁶⁹ E.g., I. Düring, "Notes on the History of the Transmission of Aristotle's Writings," *Acta Universitatis Gotoburgensis* 56 (Göteborg 1950) pp. 40–41; cf. Chr. Jacob, "Athenaeus the Librarian" in *Athenaeus and His World* p. 551 n. 178.

8 Diogenes Laertius] early 3rd century AD

No ancient source tells us where and when Diogenes was born. The epithet Laertius suggests the he may hail from Laerte in Caria or Cilicia.⁷⁰ But the epithet in combination with Diogenes suggests a nickname derived from Homer's *Iliad*, in which Odysseus is referred to as διογενής Λαερτιάδης, "descended-from-Zeus Son-of-Laertes" (2.173, 4.358).⁷¹ A different possibility is suggested by the words Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεὺς ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν, which occur in Diogenes's own work *Lives of the Philosophers* (9.109). If the phrase παρ' ἡμῶν is a self-reference, then one might translate "Apollonides of Nicaea, our fellow citizen" and conclude that Diogenes hailed from Nicaea in Bithynia.⁷² But that understanding is not widely accepted. I leave the issue undecided and turn to the date of Diogenes' birth. It, too, is nowhere reported, and the same holds regarding the date of his death. Nevertheless, we can say that the latest person mentioned in the *Lives* is Saturninus, who was a pupil of Sextus Empiricus (c. 160–210 AD).⁷³ In addition, the *Lives* exhibits no knowledge of Neo-Platonism, whose earliest representative is Plotinus (c. 205–270). Put the two together and it is reasonable to assign Diogenes' period of activity to the early third century.

In the text-translation volumes, we have referred to Diogenes' work as *The Lives of the Philosophers* or simply as *Lives*. In the manuscripts, longer, more descriptive titles or rather headings occur. An example is codex P = Parisinus Graecus 1759 (end of the 13th century), in which the following is found: Λαερτίου Διογένους βίοι καὶ γνῶμαι τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ εὐδοκιμησάντων καὶ τῶν ἐκάστη αἰρέσει ἄρεσκόντων ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ συναγωγή. Διήρηται τὸ σύγγραμμα εἰς βιβλούς δέκα, "*Diogenes Laertius' Lives and Maxims of Those Most Respected in Philosophy and a Collection in Epitome of the Doctrines of Each School. The Writing is divided into Ten Books.*" Although I have italicized the English translation, it is clear that the heading is not what we normally refer to as a title and is not to be attributed to Diogenes himself.⁷⁴ The heading is followed by a list of the philosophers discussed in each of the ten books.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ Both Caria and Cilicia are regions along the coast of Asia Minor. The former is in the southwest (looking west) and the latter in the southeast (looking south). They are separated by Lycia and Pamphylia.

⁷¹ See also *Odyssey* 2.352, 366 and 4.555, where Odysseus is called διογενής and υἱὸς Λαέρτew.

⁷² D. Runia, "Diogenes [17] Laertius" in *Brill's New Pauly*, vol. 4 (Leiden 2004) col. 452.

⁷³ Saturninus is mentioned in *Lives* 9.116.

⁷⁴ The Greek text of the heading is reported by M. Marcovich in his edition of Diogenes' *Vitae philosophorum* (Stuttgart: Teubner 1999) vol. 1 pp. 1–3.

⁷⁵ The list of philosophers discussed in Book 7 is of especial interest. It names twenty-three

Book 1 begins with an introduction (1.1–21), in which the origin and development of philosophy is set forth within a framework based on schools or sects (1.13–20). It becomes the basis of the work as a whole. The rest of Book 1 is devoted to persons who are characterized as wise, σοφοί: the Seven Sages plus four or five other individuals (1.22–122).⁷⁶ Books 2–10 discuss recognized philosophers who are divided geographically into two major groups called Ionian and Italian.⁷⁷ These two groups are further divided into schools or sects. Books 2–7 are devoted to the eastern group. The early Ionian physicists, Socrates and the minor Socratics are the subject of Book 2. Plato is the focus of Book 3 and his successors, the Academics, of Book 4. The Peripatetics appear in Book 5, the Cynics in Book 6 and the Stoics in Book 7. The western group is discussed in Books 8–10. Pythagoras, his successors and Empedocles appear in Book 8. Heraclitus, the Eleatics and others make up Book 9. Epicurus is the sole subject of Book 10. Diogenes' extraordinarily favorable characterization of Epicurus (10. 9–11) might suggest that Diogenes himself was drawn to Epicurean doctrine.⁷⁸

Our special concern is Book 5,⁷⁹ in which Diogenes' focus is the Peripatetic School. As founder of the school, Aristotle comes first (5.1–35). He is said to be a Stagirite, i.e., a native of the city Stagira, and the son of Nicomachus. We are told that Aristotle was the most genuine of Plato's students and that he left the Platonic Academy while Plato was still alive. Notice is taken of Aristotle's close relationship with Hermias, the tyrant of Atarneus; his paean in honor of Hermias is recorded. So are his will and a selection of apothegms or sayings. There follow a catalogue of Aristotle's written works and a list of his opinions on a variety of subjects. We are provided with a list of homonyms, i.e., eight persons who share the name Aristotle, after which Diogenes states succinctly that Theophrastus was the most distinguished

persons, which is considerably more than the seven persons discussed in Book 7 as it has come down to us. It also omits four persons that are discussed in Book 7. Apparently Book 7 has suffered in transmission.

⁷⁶ At 1.13 Diogenes lists seven persons who were regarded as sages, σοφοί: Thales, Solon, Periander, Cleobulus, Chilon, Bias and Pittacus. Next he names four, Anacharsis, Myson, Pherecydes and Epimenides, whom people add to the seven. Finally he tells us that some people even add the tyrant Pisistratus.

⁷⁷ One group is called Ionian because it traces its beginning through Anaximander back to Thales who was a Milesian and therefore an Ionian. The other is called Italian because its first representative, Pythagoras, worked largely in Italy (cf. 1.13).

⁷⁸ Runia, op. cit. col. 453–454.

⁷⁹ On Book 5, see M. Sollenberger, "The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae philosophorum*, Book 5," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil II vol. 36.6 (1992) pp. 3793–3879.

of Aristotle's students. That ends the life of Aristotle. It is followed by the lives of Theophrastus, Strato, Lyco, Demetrius of Phalerum and Heraclides of Pontus (5.58–94). The last two seem like awkward additions, for whereas Aristotle, Theophrastus, Strato and Lyco are joined together as successive heads of the School, neither Demetrius nor Heraclides became head of the School. Moreover and more striking, the inclusion of Heraclides among the Peripatetics is quite wrongheaded, for while Diogenes states on the authority of Sotion that Heraclides attended lectures by Aristotle (5.86), it is clear that Heraclides belongs among the Academics.⁸⁰

The account of Theophrastus' life (5.36–57) is shorter but not very different from that of Aristotle. Diogenes tells us that Theophrastus was an Eresian, i.e., a native of Eresus, and that his father was named Melantas. We learn that he studied under Aristotle, whom he succeeded as head of the School. Useful sayings are recorded,⁸¹ his written works are catalogued, and his will is given in full. The account ends with the mention of Strato as Theophrastus' successor. What we miss is an account of Theophrastus' opinions or doctrines, but that is in line with Diogenes' general practice of reserving doxographical accounts for the founders of a school.⁸² Also missing is a list of persons who share the name Theophrastus. The omission may seem trivial, but it is odd. Each of the other 5 lives contained in Book 5 includes a list of like-named persons (5.35, 61, 69, 83–85, 93–94). Moreover, on occasion it might be useful to have a list of persons all named Theophrastus. The name was not rare, and there were two Athenian archons named Theophrastus, who were contemporaries of the Eresian and in certain contexts might be confused with him.⁸³

In previous discussions of Theophrastus' views on ethics and on rhetoric/poetics (Commentaries 6.1 [2011] and 8 [2005]), I have had occasion to

⁸⁰ See below, Chapter III no. 11 page 110 with n. 123.

⁸¹ The number of Theophrastean sayings recorded by Diogenes is noticeably fewer than the sayings of Aristotle recorded by Diogenes: three as against twenty-seven. In both cases, Diogenes will have drawn on existing collections. Regarding Aristotle see D. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition* = *Studia Graeca Upsaliensia* 19 (Uppsala: University 1998) pp. 43–46.

⁸² See, e.g., the lives of Plato and Zeno. They are the founders of the Academy and the Stoa, respectively, and their lives include doxographical sections (Plato 3.67–106 and Zeno 7.38–159).

⁸³ Diogenes seems to have accepted the story that Theophrastus was originally named Tyrtamus and that Aristotle changed his name to Theophrastus. But that is not a good reason to omit a list of like-named individuals. On potentially confusing references to Theophrastus, see below, Chapter IV "The Texts" on 735 p. 179 n. 135 and 740 pp. 239–240 n. 308. And for brief remarks on the alleged change of name, see *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) pp. 26–27.

consider some of the biographical material contained in Diogenes' Life of Theophrastus. I am thinking, e.g., of Theophrastus' innate quickness (5.39 = 1.33–38), his remarks on ambition (5.40–41 = 1.52–59), on the value of time (5.40 = 1.44–45) and on silence during a symposium (5.40 = 1.42–44). Also his love of words (5.36 = 1.13) and relationship to Menander (5.36 = 1.12), his divine manner of speaking (5.38 = 1.30–31) and rejection of disorganized speech (5.39 = 1.41–42). Now in a commentary on the "Miscellaneous Items," my focus is on Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings and in particular on those titles that are not listed elsewhere in the text-translation volumes, e.g., in the sections on logic or physics or any of the other sections that precede "Miscellaneous Items." There are 13 such titles, and of these 9 are mentioned by no other source.⁸⁴

For general remarks on Diogenes' catalogue, see the introduction to Chapter III.

iii. *The Carolingian Renaissance*

9 Dunchad] 9th cent. AD

In 1944, Cora Lutz⁸⁵ published the text of an anonymous commentary on Martianus Capella's work *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury*.⁸⁶ The commentary is found in codex Parisinus Bibliothecae Nationalis Latinus 12960 fol. 25^r–30^v (late ninth century) and does not cover the entirety of Martianus' work. It is limited to part of Book 2 (p. 67.12–80.11 Dick), the whole of Book 4 (p. 150.15–210.5) and part of Book 5 (p. 210.8–224.17 Dick).⁸⁷ Lutz identified the author of the commentary as Dunchad of Rheims, who is known to us from a single reference to him in a codex now in the British Museum, Reg. 15, A XXXIII. On a folio numbered 3, we read *Dunchat Pontificis Hiberniensis quod contulit suis discipulis Monasterii Sancti Remigii docens super astrologia Capellae Varronis Martiani*. That tells us that Dunchad hailed from Ireland, was a bishop, taught at the monastery of Saint Remi and instructed his pupils concerning what

⁸⁴ In reaching these numbers, I have treated 727 no. 3 as two titles: two distinct collections, one being five books long and the other one book long. In Diogenes' catalogue, they happen to share the title *Collection of Problems*. In addition, I have not counted 16b as a title. The reference is to a single letter and not to a work or collection of letters.

⁸⁵ C. Lutz, *Dunchad, Glossae in Martianum*, Lancaster PA: American Philological Association, 1944.

⁸⁶ Martianus Capella hailed from North Africa and wrote *On the Marriage between Philology and Mercury* between 410 and 439 AD.

⁸⁷ There follow comments taken from Eriugena's commentary. See Lutz (1944) p. xxviii.

Martianus wrote (in Book 8 of *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury*) concerning astronomy.⁸⁸ But the folio on which the reference to Dunchad occurs does not belong to the codex in which it is found,⁸⁹ and no surviving commentary on Martianus carries the name Dunchad. That includes the partial commentary edited by Lutz and attributed by her to Dunchad. Not surprisingly scholars have found fault with Lutz. I cite Préaux, who criticizes her at length and argues for attributing the commentary to Martin of Laon/the Irish man.⁹⁰ This attribution also has its critics, e.g., Contreni,⁹¹ Herren⁹² and Leonardi.⁹³ Truth be told, we are ignorant concerning the number of persons who commented on Martianus in the ninth century. The author of the anonymous commentary edited by Lutz may well be someone whose name has been lost and will never be recovered.⁹⁴ Henceforth, I shall print “Dunchad” with scare-quotes, when referring to the author of Lutz’s commentary.

Our special concern regarding “Dunchad” is text 736A, which is a comment on Martianus’ Book 5 on rhetoric (p. 214.2 Dick). We are told that Corax invented the art of words. The same is reported in 736B and C. See below, this chapter no. 10 on Eriugena and Chapter IV “The Texts” on 736A–C.

10 Martin of Laon] 819–875 AD

Martin of Laon, also known as Martin the Irishman, was, as the epithet implies, one of several learned Irish immigrants to France or, as scholars prefer, Francia⁹⁵ in the ninth century. He arrived in the middle of the century

⁸⁸ On the folio in question, we find the word *astrologia* and not *astronomia*. That might give pause, but *astrologia* is classical Latin for astronomy and the manuscripts have *astrologia* in the heading to Book 8 (in a later hand). See Lutz (1962) p. 21 and 32 n. 11.

⁸⁹ The folio’s proper home has never been identified.

⁹⁰ J. Préaux, “Le commentaire de Martin de Laon sur l’oeuvre de Martianus Capella,” *Latomus* 12 (1953) pp. 437–459.

⁹¹ J. Contreni, “Three Carolingian Texts Attributed to Laon,” *Studi Medievali* 17 (1976) pp. 808–813. *The Cathedral School of Laon from 850–930: Its Manuscripts and Masters* (Munich 1978) p. 114.

⁹² M. Heeren, “The Commentary on Martianus Attributed to John Scottus: Its Hiberno-Latin Background” in *Jean Scot écrivain*, ed. G-H. Allard (Montreal-Paris 1986) p. 267. When referring to the author of the disputed commentary, Heeren prefers pseudo-Dunchad.

⁹³ Concerning the attribution to Martin of Laon, C. Leonardi, “Martianus Capella et Jean Scot,” in *Jean Scot écrivain*, ed. G-H. Allard (Montreal-Paris 1986) p. 197 is emphatic, stating that no one now believes that the commentary ought to be attributed to Martin of Laon.

⁹⁴ Contreni, *op. cit.* p. 813.

⁹⁵ By preferring Francia, scholars make clear that the territory in question (the Frankish territory ruled over by Charles the Bald in the middle of the ninth century) is not identical

and settled in Laon,⁹⁶ where he taught in the cathedral school. He was close in age to John Scotus Eriugena (below no. 10), who taught in the palace school of Charles the Bald, which was situated either in Laon or in its environs.⁹⁷ Martin will have known Eriugena well, but he did not share his enthusiasm for philosophy and avoided controversy. Rather, Martin gained repute as a teacher in the cathedral school—he styled himself *magister Laudunensis*⁹⁸—and as an authority on matters Greek.

Martin will have taught a variety of subjects including Latin literature, which in ninth century Laon included Martianus Capella's work the *Marriage of Philology and Mercury*. Most likely Martin made notes, which he used in teaching that work and which could have been incorporated into a commentary. That encourages the idea that Martin is the author of comments once attributed to "Dunchad" (above no. 8), but that idea no longer finds ready acceptance. What we can say is that Martin's interest in and work on the Greek language are well represented in a ninth century manuscript (codex Laudunensis 444), large portions of which are written in the hand of Martin.⁹⁹ The contents include verses that have been excerpted from the poems of Eriugena and glossed, verses written by Martin himself, and a Greek-Latin glossary in which Theophrastus' *Peplos* is cited as the source of a report concerning the invention of the Greek alphabet (fol. 289^v = 735).¹⁰⁰ Given Martin's interest in matters Greek, one is tempted to think that Martin consulted the Theophrastean work directly, and given references to this

with that of modern France. It did not include Brittany and land east of a line drawn between Marseilles and Ostend in Belgium (O'Meara [1988] pp. 9–10). Put positively, Francia under the rule of Charles the Bald refers to the western part of the Frankish territories, or in Latin, Francia Occidentalis (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 9 [1972] p. 701 col. 1).

⁹⁶ Laon is the Roman Laudunum, a town in northern France located some 85 miles NE of Paris. The town was fortified by the Romans and served to check invasions by the Franks, Burgundians, Vandals, Alani and Huns. At the end of the sixth century, it became an important center within the Frankish kingdom, and in the ninth century it was favored by Charles the Bald (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 13 [1972] p. 712 vol. 13 col. 1).

⁹⁷ On the palace school, see O'Meara (1988) pp. 12–15.

⁹⁸ Contreni, op. cit. (1978) p. 95, 101.

⁹⁹ Codex Laudunensis 444 = no. 2120 in *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*, Teil II: Laon-Paderborn, ed. B. Bishoff and B. Ebersperger (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2004) pp. 35–36.

¹⁰⁰ Under the heading "Petit Glossaire," Miller pp. 21–22 cites folio 289^v and gives the text in which Theophrastus is named. If I understand correctly, scholars generally recognize the glossary in question as that of Martin himself, but there are expressions of caution. See, e.g., B. Gansweidt, under "Martin" no. 13 in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 6 (1993) col. 347. Given Martin's reputation in matters Greek, I would like to accept the attribution to Martin, but for our purposes the important thing is that we have a ninth century text, other than a commentary on Martianus Capella, in which the *Peplos* is cited by title and attributed to Theophrastus.

work in the writings of “Dunchad,” Eriugena and Remigius (736A–C), one might think that the work circulated in ninth century Francia or at least in Laon and the environs. But that would be hasty. See the commentary on the title (727 no. 10) as well as the several texts to which reference has been made.

11 John Scotus Eriugena] fl. 850–870 AD

The best known of the several Irish scholars who contributed to the Carolingian Renaissance is Johannes Scot(t)us Eri(u)gena. The second and third names are all but synonymous, meaning “Irish” and “born in Ireland,” respectively. In what follows, I shall refer simply to Eriugena.¹⁰¹

That Eriugena hailed from Ireland is not to be doubted. By way of confirmation, O’Meara cites Bishop Prudentius of Troyes, who was at one time a friend of Eriugena and who wrote, *te solum omnium acutissimum Galliae transmisit Hibernia*, “Ireland sent you (Eriugena), on your own the most acute of all, to Gaul” (*On Predestination against John Scotus* 14, PL vol. 115 col. 1194A).¹⁰² In Ireland, Eriugena will have been educated in a monastery school, where he received instruction in both religious and secular subjects. He learned not only Latin but also Greek, at least to some level, so that over time, after his move to the continent, he would become a translator of Greek writings into Latin.¹⁰³

In or around 845, Eriugena moved from Ireland to Francia,¹⁰⁴ perhaps motivated in part by the increasing intensity of Viking raids on his homeland but also by a pattern of Irish immigration to Francia and the cultural climate under Charles the Bald, whose rule ran from 840 to 877. Eriugena became involved with both the palace school of Charles and the cathedral school at Laon.¹⁰⁵ He translated works by Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus

¹⁰¹ In the text-translation volumes, the heading to the translation of 528 and 736B has “Erigena” (without “u”). That is not wrong, but modern scholars writing in English prefer “Eriugena,” and in this commentary I have conformed. The same holds for my comments below on 528 and 736A–C.

¹⁰² O’Meara p. 2.

¹⁰³ W. Berschin, “Griechisches bei den Iren,” in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. H. Löwe (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta 1982) vol. 1 p. 510; O’Meara p. 8. D. Carabine, *John Scotus Eriugena* (Oxford: University Press 2000) p. 14 finds the scholarly discussion of teaching of Greek in ninth century Ireland inconclusive. For him “the important fact is that Eriugena was able to read Greek, not only because of the translations he made but also because in his own work, the *Periphyseon*, we find a masterly knowledge of Eastern and Western authorities.”

¹⁰⁴ See above, n. 95.

¹⁰⁵ The palace school of Charles was in the region of Laon, though its exact location is problematic (O’Meara p. 14).

Confessor and pseudo-Dionysius, the supposed disciple of St. Paul.¹⁰⁶ He also wrote commentaries on John the Evangelist, Martianus Capella and pseudo-Dionysius, the author of *On the Celestial Hierarchy*.¹⁰⁷ His work *On Predestination* involved him in theological controversy: it was condemned in 855 and again in 859.¹⁰⁸ His greatest work is the *Periphyseon*, the *Division of Nature*,¹⁰⁹ whose primary theme is the creation and return of all things to their source, which is God.¹¹⁰

Eriugena's comments on Martianus Capella's *Marriage of Philology and Mercury* are preserved in different versions—codex Parisinus Bibliothecae Nationalis lat. 12960 and codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct.T.2.19—for which various explanations have been advanced. Liebeschütz has suggested that the differences are attributable to different times of composition, i.e., different sets of comments made by Eriugena, first in the early 840s and again some ten years later.¹¹¹ Schrimpf thinks there that there may have been a single set of comments by Eriugena written in the margins and between the lines of a single manuscript of Martianus' work. These comments were excerpted at a later time by two persons of different interests, and their selections have come down to us in separate manuscripts.¹¹² Herren calls attention to differences in the lemmata that govern Eriugena's comments and suggests that two different manuscripts of Martianus' text were commented upon at different times by Eriugena.¹¹³ Carabine speaks of classroom notes, from which different versions of the commentary arose.¹¹⁴ I leave the issue undecided.

For our purposes, Eriugena's commentary on Book 5 (*de rhetorica*) is of special interest, for there Corax of Syracuse is said to have invented the art of

¹⁰⁶ For discussion, see O'Meara pp. 51–79 and Carabine, op. cit. pp. 16–20.

¹⁰⁷ See O'Meara pp. 155–158.

¹⁰⁸ See O'Meara pp. 32–50 and D, Carabine, op. cit. pp. 9–12.

¹⁰⁹ *Periphyseon* is a transliteration of Περὶ φύσεως. The English title, *Division of Nature*, reflects the Latin title, *De divisione naturae*.

¹¹⁰ See O'Meara pp. 80–154 and Carabine, op. cit. pp. 22–26.

¹¹¹ H. Liebeschütz, "The Place of Martianus' Glossae in the Development of Eriugena's Thought," in *The Mind of Eriugena*, ed. J.O'Meara and L. Bieler (Dublin 1973) pp. 49–57.

¹¹² G. Schrimpf, "Zur Frage der Authentizität unserer Texte von Johannes Scotus' 'Annotationes in Martianum'" in *The Mind of Eriugena* (above, n. 111) pp. 125–139. The codices in question are Parisinus Bibliothecae Nationalis lat. 12960 and Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct.T.2.19. The view of Jeaneau (1978) pp. 94–95 n. 13 is similar. He suggests two abridgments of the same commentary, made either by one or two abbreviators and on the basis of different choices.

¹¹³ Heeren (above n. 92) pp. 270–271.

¹¹⁴ Carabine, op. cit. p. 15.

rhetoric, and Theophrastus' *Peplos/Robe* is cited as the source for this report: ἐκ τοῦ Πέπλου Θεοφράστου, *id est ex Peplo Teofrasti* (736B). A similar report is found in the commentary of "Dunchad" (736A). There is agreement in the Greek words reported and in the Latin translation. Differences in presentation or format are relatively unimportant.¹¹⁵ Apparently both reports go back to the same source either directly or indirectly. That source may have been a work known as the *Robe* of Theophrastus, but the title itself and the attribution to Theophrastus are problematic.

A second reference to the *Robe* of Theophrastus occurs in one version of the first book of Eriugena's commentary, i.e., in codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct.T.2.19 on folio 7^v.¹¹⁶ The text in question is 582. It concerns the god Apollo and purports to explain why the god is called the Pythian augur. There is confusion here: Pythian Apollo has been transferred from Delphi to the island of Delos, where the god will have killed the serpent Pytho. Theophrastus will not have embraced such an error in ignorance. That raises questions not only concerning the character and reliability of the *Robe* but also the attribution of the work to Theophrastus and the sources on which Eriugena has drawn. In the case before us, it is hard not to think that Eriugena is responsible for the confusion or that he is dependent on an intermediary that already placed the legend of Apollo and the serpent in Delos.¹¹⁷ See below Chapter III "Titles of Books" 727 no. 10 on the *Peplos* and Chapter IV "The Texts" on 582.

¹¹⁵ In Eriugena the initial phrase referring to Theophrastus' *Peplos* is first given in Greek and then in Latin; in Dunchad the phrase is broken up: the Greek words are translated individually. Aside from the translation, Eriugena does not comment on the initial phrase; Dunchad adds (unnecessarily) *sic vocatur ipse liber*. In what follows both authors translate individual words, τέχνην, λόγων and εὔρατο, but in one case, Κόραξ, Eriugena translates with *corvus*, while Dunchad adds by way of explanation *proprium nomen*, a "proper name." I have not studied the codices, but on the basis of Lutz' two critical apparatus, it appears that in Dunchad the explanation *proprium nomen* and the translation of λόγων are both written above the line. Apparently that is not true of Eriugena.

¹¹⁶ Labowsky (1943) p. 189 = Jeaneau (1978) p. 116. On pp. 95–96, Jeaneau offers brief remarks on Eriugena's sources.

¹¹⁷ Sheldon-Williams p. 2, who argues that Eriugena did not know Plato and Aristotle at first hand, does allow the possibility that Eriugena was familiar with a Greek work known as the *Robe* of Theophrastus. But he leaves open whether the work in question actually went back to Theophrastus. Jeaneau (1979) p. 7, who says that Eriugena had access to certain elements of Hellenistic thought "above all" through patristic literature, thinks it at least possible that Eriugena read "a mysterious" *Robe* of Theophrastus, which has now disappeared. That Eriugena actually had in his hands a Greek work written by Theophrastus is in my judgment quite unlikely. See Chapter III "Titles of Books" 727 no. 10 on the *Peplos*.

Twice in his commentary on Martianus, Eriugena explains the name of Theophrastus. On the first occasion, we read, *Theophrastus dei expositio vel deum exponens*; θεός, *deus*, φράζω, *expono* (p. 203.7–8 Lutz = 6).¹¹⁸ We have translated “Theophrastus (means) setting forth of god or one who sets forth god; *theos* (means) god and *phrazô* (means) I set forth.” If I understand correctly, here *exponere* means “to explain” or “to expound” (LS s.v. II.B) and *expositio* is the corresponding noun (s.v. II.B). On the second occasion, *expositio* is replaced by *compositio* and *expono* by *compono* (p. 204.21–22 Lutz = app. 6). The idea is putting together or composing in writing a statement concerning god. With *componere* we might have expected the preposition *de*, but *componere* with a direct object referring to the subject of composition is attested (LS s.v. II.4.b). For further remarks on Theophrastus’ name, see below, this chapter no. 12 pp. 40–41 on Remigius and Chapter IV “The Texts” pp. 178–179 on 735.

12 Remigius of Auxerre] c. 841–908AD

Like “Dunchad” and Eriugena, Remigius may have been an Irishman by birth, but it is also possible and perhaps more probable that he was of Burgundian descent.¹¹⁹ Be that as it may, he was a Benedictine monk, who studied under Heieric of Auxerre. In 876 he succeeded his teacher as master of the school, where he remained for some seven years. He then moved to Rheims, where he taught young clerics in the liberal arts. In 900 he moved again, this time to Paris, where he taught until his death perhaps in 908 or earlier.¹²⁰

His writings were numerous but also hard to identify. For according to Lutz, some works are anonymous, confusion with the works of other authors occurred early, and in the case of commentaries, pupils added and subtracted material, which resulted in different versions. Lutz lists 34 writings, which she groups under seven headings: Biblical exegesis, Treatises

¹¹⁸ In the edition of Lutz, the spelling of Theophrastus’ name varies. On p. 203.7 and 204.21 = 6.1 and app. 6.1 the name in Latin begins with “Th.” On p. 110.15 = 736B.2, the “h” is omitted. Presumably the inconsistency reflects an inconsistency in the codex Parisinus Bibliothecae Nationalis lat. 12960 and is of little significance, for the inconsistency is attributable to the copyist and not to Eriugena.

¹¹⁹ On Irish descent, see W. Stahl, *Martianus Capella and the Liberal Arts* (New York: Columbia 1971) vol. 1 p. 63 n. 38; on Burgundian descent, see Lutz (1962) p. 5. Heeren (above, note 92) p. 272 refers without hesitation to Remigius’ commentary as continental.

¹²⁰ Remigius’ death is noted succinctly in an obituary list at Auxerre: *obiit Remigius, monachus et egregius doctor* (codex Parisinus Latinus 5253 f. 13^v, cited by Lutz (1962) p. 3 n. 9).

on dogma, Philosophical treatise, Works on grammar, Commentaries on literary works, Excerpts from Valerius Maximus, Letters and Textbook. Our special concern is with Commentaries on literature and in particular with Remigius' commentary on Martianus Capella's *Marriage of Philology and Mercury*. It has been transmitted in several forms: as marginal notes, as continuous commentary broken up by portions of Martianus' text and as unbroken running commentary with short lemmata, glosses and explanation. According to Lutz, the last form is the original. In some manuscripts the commentary is anonymous and in two it is attributed to Eriugena, but the ascription to Remigius is secure.¹²¹

Four times in the course of his commentary, Remigius refers to Theophrastus by name. On one of these occasions, Remigius is commenting on Book 5 of Martianus work, where the phrase *de gente Corvina* occurs (5.435 p. 214.12 Dick). Remigius' comment runs as follows: *Corvinus rhetor fuit; ipse est et Corax Siracusanus qui regulas Teophrasti Latinis tradidit*. ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΠΕΠΛΟΥ ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΥ ΤΕΧΝΗΝ ΛΟΓΩΝ ΚΟΡΑΣ ΣΥΡΑΚΟΥΣΙΟΣ ΕΥΡΑΤΟ, "Corvinus was an orator; he is also the Corax of Syracuse, who handed over the rules of Theophrastus to the Latins. From the *Robe* of Theophrastus: Corax of Syracuse invented the art of words" (vol. 2 p. 70.19–21 Lutz = 736C). Both the reference to Theophrastus and the subsequent statement concerning Corax are in Greek without an accompanying Latin translation. That might inspire confidence in Remigius regarding his knowledge of Greek authors, but in fact Remigius is almost certainly drawing on "Dunchad" and Eriugena, who provide the Greek together with a Latin translation. Moreover, in what immediately precedes the reference to the *Robe* of Theophrastus, Remigius tells us that Theophrastus' rules of rhetoric were handed over to the Latins by Corax. At best that assertion is quite improbable. See below, Chapter IV "The Texts" on 736A–C.

On a second occasion, Remigius is commenting on Book 2, where Martianus writes, *iter in Galactium flectit*, "she (Philology) turns toward the Galaxy" (2.208 p. 77.15 Dick). Focusing on these words, Remigius comments, *id est in lacteum circumum*. *Macrobius de lacteo circulo sic ait: Teofrastus lacteum circumum dixit esse compaginem, qua de duobus hemispheriis caeli sphaera solidita est, et ideo, ubi orae, id est fines, utrimque convenerant, notabilem claritatem videri*, "I.e., toward the Milky Circle/Way. Macrobius says the following concerning the Milky Way: 'Theophrastus said that the Milky Way is the junction, by which the heavenly sphere is fastened together from

¹²¹ Lutz (1962) pp. 50–51.

two hemispheres, and that for this reason, where the edges, i.e., the boundaries, have come together from each side, a striking brightness is apparent” (vol. 1 p. 205,28–206.1 Lutz = app. 166). Here Remigius cites Macrobius (4th century AD) for a report concerning Theophrastus. He does not give the title of Macrobius’ work, but it can be supplied: namely *On Cicero’s Dream of Scipio*. Remigius does not misrepresent Macrobius. In fact, he quotes his source with considerable accuracy, making only two changes, both of which are additions for the sake of clarity.¹²² But has Macrobius correctly reported the view of Theophrastus? Steinmetz thinks that he has, despite the fact that the view attributed to Theophrastus is out of line with Aristotelian doctrine.¹²³ In contrast, Sharples is inclined to reject the report: he calls it dubious and suggests that Theophrastus reported someone else’s view, which was then mistakenly attributed to Theophrastus.¹²⁴ Be that as it may, it is of some interest that in 166 Remigius makes clear that he is reporting Theophrastus through an intermediary,¹²⁵ whereas in 736C.3 he cites Theophrastus in a way that suggests direct borrowing: ἐκ τοῦ Πέπλου Θεοφράστου. But suggestion is not proof.

On a third occasion, Remigius is concerned with Book 9, in which Harmony is made to describe the benefits that she has brought to mankind through music. She refers to herself as a *moderatrix animae*, a regulator of the soul, and speaks of imparting harmony and temperance, whose importance Theophrastus elaborated upon (9.923 p. 490.14–20 Dick). Remigius picks out Theophrastus’ name and comments as follows: *THEOPHRASTUS proprium nomen auctoris et interpretatur dei expositor vel deum exponens; theos deus, frastes expositor*, “Theophrastus is the proper name of an author and means ‘one-who-explains’ or ‘explaining god’; *theos* ‘god,’ *frastes*

¹²² Martianus is quoting Macrobius 1.15.4 (p. 61.17–20 Willis). The changes are two: within the report of what Theophrastus said, *circulum* is added after *lacteum* and *id est fines* is added after *orae*.

¹²³ P. Steinmetz, *Die Physik des Theophrast* (Bad Homburg: Max Gehlen 1964) = *Palingenesia* vol. 1 pp. 167–168 is explicitly dissociating himself from E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: Reisland 1879) p. 836 n. 1 and H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, 3rd ed. (Berlin 1958 = repr. 1879) p. 230.

¹²⁴ Sharples, *Commentary* 3 on physics (1998) pp. 108–110.

¹²⁵ I. Kidd, “Theophrastus’ *Meteorology*, Aristotle and Posidonius” in *Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical and Scientific Writings*, ed. by W. Fortenbaugh and D. Gutas (New Brunswick: Transaction 1992) = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities, vol. 5 p. 297 is inclined to believe that the report concerning Theophrastus’ understanding of the Milky Way goes back to Posidonius. If that is correct, then Remigius is reporting not only through Macrobius as intermediary but also through Posidonius and so at least at third hand. Kidd describes the view attributed to Theophrastus as “nonsense.”

‘one-who-explains.’” (vol. 2 p. 323.22–23 Lutz = **app. 6**). The wording is quite close to what Eriugena says concerning Theophrastus’ name (6, printed above in comment no. 11 p. 38), and for that reason Remigius’ text is not printed but only mentioned in the apparatus of parallel texts. Presumably Remigius is drawing on Eriugena, while making a few changes: he adds *interpretatur*, which is understood in the text of Eriugena; he changes *expositio* to *expositor* thereby keeping the focus on the person or agent as against the act; he transliterates the Greek to read *theos* and *frastes*; and he prefers *expositor* to *expono*, which again keeps the focus on the agent. The same may be said of *frastes* in contrast with φράζω in Eriugena’s text. Only here we might expect *fraster* as a transliteration of φραστήρ. Remigius seems to be influenced by nouns that end in τής.¹²⁶ Or is he influenced by a source other than Eriugena?

The fourth occasion also concerns Book 9 and the benefits brought by Harmony to mankind. Harmony has been listing her benefits to mankind and spoken *inter alia* of music being used to dampen ferocity, to assuage the gods, to arouse soldiers for battle and wrestlers for competition, to treat mental derangement, diseased bodies and drunkenness. In this context, Harmony asks rhetorically whether she has provided therapy for disease, after which she says that the ancients were able to effect cures by incantation, that Asclepiades used to heal/alleviate deafness with the trumpet,¹²⁷ and that Theophrastus used to apply pipes to afflictions of the mind, *ad affectiones animi tibias Theophrastus adhibebat* (9.926 p. 492.19–493.4 Dick). Remigius’ comment on Theophrastus is short and lexical: *TIBIAS THEOPHRASTUS ADHIBEBAT asserebat vel apponebat*, “Theophrastus used to apply pipes: he used to plant or put near” (vol. 2 p. 327.14–15 Lutz = **app. 726A**). The comment seems unnecessary (the average reader could gloss *adhibebat* with *asserebat* and *apponebat*) and leaves one wondering whether Theophrastus himself worked with patients (like Asclepiades, he used to effect cures

¹²⁶ See LSJ s.v., where φραστήρ is explained by reference to φράζω. We might compare σωτήρ, which is derived from σώζω. On suffixes that denote agents including τήρ and τής, see, e.g., Goodwin and Gulick, *Greek Grammar* p. 184 sec. 818.

¹²⁷ Asclepiades of Prusias ad Mare in Bithynia was born in the 2nd century BC and died sometime in the 1st century. He held that the body was composed of corpuscles or unattached particles that moved through ducts or pores, and that illness arose when the movement of the corpuscles was hindered and became unbalanced. Given such a theory, one might suppose that music could play a role in restoring balance. On Asclepiades, see M. Wellmann, “Asklepiades no. 39” in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 2 (1896) col. 1632–1633 and V. Nutton, “Asclepiades [6] of Bithynia” in *Brill’s New Pauly* vol. 2 (2003) col. 96–98.

with music) or simply observed and reported what others attempted to accomplish with music. The latter seems more likely, but on occasion he himself may have tried applying pipes. Be that as it may, we can be certain that Theophrastus recognized a cathartic effect of music. See Porphyry, *On Claudius Ptolemy's Harmonics* 1.3 (p. 65.13–15 Düring = 716.130–132): “The nature of music is one. It is the movement of the soul that occurs in correspondence with its release from the evils due to the emotions; and if it were not this, neither would it be the nature of music.” Here the focus seems to be on short-term cures much like the homoeopathic cure that Aristotle attributes to tragedy (*Poetics* 6 1449b27–28).¹²⁸ A person gains relief but has not become immune to unwanted emotion. That Theophrastus also recognized the possibility of music working a long-term cure is suggested by Apollonius, *Amazing Stories* 49.1–3 = 726A.1–4, who reports that according to Theophrastus “music cures many of the ills that affect the soul and body, such as fainting, fright and prolonged disturbances of the mind.” In regard to bodily cures, Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.18 624A–B = 726B.1–3 reports that according to Theophrastus sufferers of sciatica were permanently cured if someone played the *aulos* over the affected part of the body. But Gellius, *Attic Nights* 4.13.1–2 = 726C.1–3 cites Theophrastus and speaks of a piper playing over the pains of sciatica and diminishing them. For detailed discussion I refer to *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 284–297 and to my article “Apollonius on Theophrastus on Aristoxenus” (2012a) pp. 162–169, 171–175. Here I add only that when Martianus writes *tibias Theophrastus adhibebat*, we should think of *auloi*. In the very next sentence, Martianus has Harmony ask rhetorically, *ischidas quis nesciat expelli aulica suavitate?* “Who does not know that sciatica is expelled by the sweet sound of the *aulos*?” And whereas Gellius writes, *tibicen incinat*, “the piper plays over (the pains of sciatica),” Athenaeus has *καταυλήσοι*, “played the *aulos* over (the painful place).” See also Eriugena (p. 204.25) and Remigius (vol. 2 p. 327.19), both of whom identify the *tibia* with the *aulos*.

¹²⁸ That Theophrastus followed Aristotle in regard to the catharsis of emotions is not to be doubted. See, e.g. my article “An Aristotelian and Theophrastean Analysis of Laughter” in *Theophrastean Studies* (Stuttgart: Steiner 2003) p. 106.

iv. *Byzantium*

13 Georgius Choeroboscus] fl. early 9th century AD

George the Swineherd was at one time assigned to the sixth century,¹²⁹ but today he seems securely placed in the first half of the ninth century.¹³⁰ In various manuscripts containing his works, George is referred to as a Byzantine grammarian, ecumenical teacher, deacon and keeper of the archives at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. George wrote and lectured on a variety of topics including declension and conjugation, prosody and poetic figures. Most of the surviving works come to us in the form of lecture notes ἀπὸ φωνῆς, commentaries made by students who were present at George's lectures. Attentive students will have recorded what they heard with accuracy, but note taking is necessarily selective and therefore open to misleading omission, not to say outright error. An apparent example will confront us when we consider a passage that mentions the Theophrastean title Περί εὐρέσεως/εὐρήσεως (666 no. 4). The passage is found in George's commentary *On Hephaestion's Handbook*, which Nigel Wilson characterizes as "sketchy and not free from error."¹³¹

14 Michael of Ephesus] 12th century AD

Michael was born in Ephesus (he calls Heraclitus a fellow citizen¹³²) and moved to Byzantium, where he may have practiced medicine. He became acquainted with Anna Comnena (1083–c. 1150 AD), who is thought to have played a significant role in a revival of interest in the writings of Aristotle. As part of the revival, Michael composed exegetical works on Aristotle's writings on logic, biology, metaphysics, ethics and politics. The works lack originality, being largely dependent on the works of earlier commentators.

Like his contemporary Eustratius of Nikaia, Michael commented on the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Eustratius wrote on Books 1 and 6 (CAG vol. 20 pp. 1–122, 256–406 Heylbut), while Michael focused on Books 5, 9 and 10 (CAG vol. 22.3

¹²⁹ So L. Cohn, "Choiroboskos" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 3 (1899) col. 2363.51.

¹³⁰ R. Kaster, *Guardians of the Language* (Berkeley: University of California 1988) pp. 395–396 and R. Browning, "Choiroboskos, George" in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (Oxford: University Press 1991) vol. 1 p. 425.

¹³¹ The Theophrastean title is discussed below, Chapter III "Titles of Books" pp. 112–115. Wilson's characterization of George's commentary is found in *Scholars of Byzantium* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) pp. 160–161.

¹³² Michael, *Commentary on Nicomachean Ethics* 10.5 1176a3–4 (CAG vol. 20 p. 570.21–22 Heylbut).

pp. 1–72 Hayduck, vol. 20 pp. 461–620 Heylbut).¹³³ Michael draws heavily on the so-called Anonymous commentator (above, no. 5), who worked toward the end of the second century AD and produced a compilation of scholia on the *Ethics*. The Anonymous cites Theophrastus three times, once in regard to Book 4 and twice in regard to Book 5. Since Michael does not comment on Book 4, no comparison can be drawn between Michael and the Anonymous. But Michael does comment on Book 5, so that comparison is not only possible but also indicative of Michael's dependence on the Anonymous. In regard to *Nicomachean Ethics* 5.3 (5.1 OCT¹³⁴) 1129b29–30 = 529A–B, Michael not only follows the Anonymous in referring to Theognis and Phocylides, but also in allowing that both of the poets may have used the proverb “In justice every virtue is brought together.” In addition, Michael follows the Anonymous in citing Theophrastus, but he goes beyond what the Anonymous actually says when he tells us that Theophrastus, in his work *On Dispositions*, attributes the proverb in question to Theognis.¹³⁵ In regard to 5.10 (5.8 OCT) 1135b11–19 = 530,¹³⁶ Michael exhibits a measure of independence in the rearrangement of material, but striking evidence of dependence is his acceptance of an error made by the Anonymous. Whereas Aristotle lists four ways in which a person can do harm to another, the Anonymous reports five ways and so does Michael. Each adds ὥς, “manner” (CAG vol. 20 p. 238.15–17 Heylbut and vol. 22.3 p. 54.4 Hayduck).¹³⁷

2. Anthologies

15 Stobaeus] Early 5th cent. AD

Ioannes Stobaeus or in English John of Stobi (in Macedonia) composed an anthology of poetry and prose. It runs four volumes and contains excerpts drawn from c. 500 authors, beginning with Homer and ending in the fourth century AD. There are no excerpts from Christian writers. The first volume is primarily concerned with metaphysics and physics, the second and third

¹³³ See, e.g., R. Sorabji, “The Ancient Commentators on Aristotle,” and H. Mercken, “The Greek Commentators on Aristotle’s *Ethics*,” in *Aristotle Transformed*, ed. by R. Sorabji (London: Duckworth 1990) pp. 20–21 and pp. 407–443, respectively.

¹³⁴ On the addition of OCT numbers, see above, n. 51.

¹³⁵ See below, Chapter 4 “The Texts” on 529A–B pp. 208–211.

¹³⁶ Text 530 is the text of the Anonymous. Here there is no A–B, for Michael omits any reference to Theophrastus. That seems to be simple omission and not a mark of independence on the part of Michael.

¹³⁷ For slightly fuller discussion, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 88–89.

with ethics and the fourth collects material closely related to ethics like politics and household management. The excerpts are organized under headings, and typically the excerpts of poetry precede those of prose.

Stobæus has not ignored Theophrastus. In the text-translation volumes, we have printed or cited twenty-six passages in which Theophrastus is named. The majority appear under "Ethics": fourteen have been printed¹³⁸ and two have been cited in the upper apparatus of parallel texts.¹³⁹ Of the other ten passages, four appear under "Politics," two under "Doxography," two in the section on Theophrastus' "Life," one under "Psychology" and one among the "Miscellaneous Items."¹⁴⁰ Some of these texts are short, while others are long; some are of little importance, while others contain important information, which can fill a gap or serve as a corrective when compared with other sources that almost certainly present a false or misleading picture of Theophrastus.

Ethical texts are in the majority and well illustrate the variety of Stobæus' Theophrastean excerpts. There are quite short sayings that begin by identifying the speaker as Theophrastus, after which comes the saying itself. Examples are 443–445, which deal with envy, Schadenfreude and slander. 469 on self-respect and shame, 521 on trustworthiness, 539 on the character of youth, and 565 on the attraction of a beautiful woman who is all decked out. Other examples of short sayings are perhaps of greater interest: e.g., 517 in which vengeance is listed as a factor in holding together the life of men and 557 which offers a definition of eros in terms of excess. Longer than a simple saying are 526, in which Theophrastus warns against acting while angry (in the text-translation volumes the text runs 10 lines), and 523, in which Theophrastus states how a person must act if he is going to be admired for his relationship to the gods (13 lines). The latter is paraenetic in character¹⁴¹ and serves as an important corrective regarding the hostility directed toward women in 486.¹⁴² Still longer is 465 (22 lines), which emphasizes the importance of reflecting upon and choosing the best life. Short and different is 503 in that it takes the form of a report and not

¹³⁸ Texts 443, 444, 445, 449A, 465, 469, 503, 517, 521, 523, 526, 539, 557, 565.

¹³⁹ Texts 538F and 558.

¹⁴⁰ Texts 628, 650, 661 and 662 under "Politics," Texts 232 and 236 under "Doxography," Texts 18 no. 13 and app. 25 under "Life," Text 269 under "Psychology" and Text 738 (= 727 no. 14) among the "Miscellaneous Items."

¹⁴¹ See my article "Παράίνεσις: Isocrates and Theophrastus," *Hyperboreus* 15 (2009) pp. 251–262.

¹⁴² On 523 in relation to 486, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) p. 532.

a saying: we are told that Theophrastus distinguished choice from other causes and was inclined to the view that the nature of each individual is fate.

Longest (37 lines) and especially important is text **449A**. It comes from Arius Didymus' epitome of Peripatetic ethics and has as its focus Theophrastus' treatment of moral virtue and vice. As a caveat, I call attention to the fact that the excerpt contains Aristotle's definition of moral virtue. If we accept that on the whole Stobaeus reproduces his sources verbatim¹⁴³ and that in the case in question Stobaeus' source has not introduced a foreign element into a Theophrastean passage, then we are apt to conclude that Theophrastus accepted the Aristotelian definition. I think that he did, but it must be admitted that by itself text **449A** is not certain proof. For it is at least possible that **449A** may be exceptional in that Stobaeus has not reproduced his source verbatim. Rather, he has intervened by adding Aristotelian material. Or perhaps and more likely Arius Didymus mixed in a piece of Aristotle, which Stobaeus reproduced verbatim along with the Theophrastean material. Whatever might be the truth concerning **449A**, we are reminded that when dealing with fragments, it is prudent to consider each fragment with care and not to assume that it is in line with our general expectations. For fuller discussion of **449A**, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 95–97.

Our special concern in the present commentary is **738** which occurs in Stobaeus' *Anthology* within a section that carries the heading "On the (saying/proverb) 'Know yourself.'" The text is short (3 1/2 lines) and does not take the form of a saying. Rather we are offered a report, which begins with the statement, "'Know yourself' is taken as a proverb," after which Theophrastus is cited as a witness. We are then told that most people assign the saying to Chilo, but Clearchus thinks that it was said by the god to Chilo. The text will be discussed below in Chapter IV "The Texts" pp. 215–220. Here I call attention to the fact that sections in Stobaeus' *Anthology* bring together related texts that may be of interest when discussing a particular text within a given section. That is the case with **738**. There are variations on the proverb that make the same point in different ways and texts that contradict **738** or appear to do so. See below, Chapter IV.

¹⁴³ See D. Hahm, "The Ethical Doxography of Arius Didymus," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (ed. W. Haase) vol. II 36.4 pp. 2940–2943, who argues that on the whole Stobaeus reproduces his sources verbatim or with only minimal change.

16 *Light of the Soul*

The *Lumen animae* or *Light of the Soul* refers to a compilation of *exempla*, illustrative materials, drawn from natural history and intended for use in Christian sermons. More precisely, the title refers to three related compilations, which were put together by three separate compilers during the fourteenth century. Scholars today use different letters, A, B and C, in order to distinguish between the different compilations.¹⁴⁴ *Lumen A* is the earliest. It was composed by a Dominican friar named Berengar of Landorra in Spain. He was Master General of the Dominican Order between 1312 and 1317 and became Archbishop of Compostella in 1317. He died in 1330. *Lumen B* is not much later; the earliest surviving manuscript dates from 1332. Until recently, the scribe of this manuscript, Godfrey of Vorau in Austria, was generally believed to have been the author of *Lumen B*. He was canon of the Augustinian house in Vorau and will have made use of *Lumen A*. The attribution to Godfrey has now been challenged, but the jury is still out.¹⁴⁵ *Lumen C* is still later. The name of the initial compiler is not known. He seems to have worked in Austria and completed his version around mid-century, for the earliest surviving manuscript dates from 1357. The compiler knew of *Lumen B* and borrowed from it, but he borrowed more from *Lumen A*. This beginning gave rise to a version of the *Lumen* that Nigel Harris labels C1. It runs for c. 60 chapters, which are arranged alphabetically. Alongside this version there developed a longer version, C2, in which alphabetical arrangement was abandoned, and greater emphasis was placed on the Virgin Mary. Concerning these versions and further developments regarding C2 (e.g., restoring a semblance of alphabetical arrangement by bringing together the Marian chapters), I refer to Harris' recent study.¹⁴⁶

It is generally agreed that the materials brought together in *Light of the Soul* must be used with considerable caution. I limit myself to a single

¹⁴⁴ On *Lumen A*, B and C, see Schmitt (1971b) p. 266; M. & R. Rouse, "The Texts Called *Lumen Animae*," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 41 (1971) pp. 5–113; Sharples (1984) pp. 187–189 and (1998) pp. 110–111; Huby (1999) p. 5; N. Harris, *The Light of the Soul: The Lumen animae C and Ulrich Putsch's Das liecht der sel* (Bern: Peter Lang 2007) pp. 15–41; Fortenbaugh (2011) pp. 105–107.

¹⁴⁵ The challenge comes from F. Knapp, *Die Literatur des Spätmittelalters in den Ländern Österreich, Steiermark, Kärnten, Salzburg und Tirol von 1273 bis 1439*, vol. 2.1 (Graz 1999) p. 365. Harris, op. cit. p. 24 withholds judgment.

¹⁴⁶ Harris, op. cit. pp. 27–41. In what follows, Harris offers facing editions of *Lumen C* and Ulrich Putsch's *Das liecht der sel* (pp. 70–465). Whereas *Lumen A* and B were first published/printed centuries ago (B was published in Augsburg by Anton Sorg in 1477 and A in Augsburg by Johannes Miller in 1518) Harris' 2007 edition of C is the *editio princeps*.

example. It is text 344, in which we read that the third natural property of dreams is to exercise and to enlighten the intellect. For an explanation we are referred to Theophrastus' book of *Commentaries* about the part (of the soul) concerned with sensation. There follows a comparison with the hand. If it is trained at a time when it is poorly disposed for a craft, it will soon become more skillful. Reference is made to the Philosopher, i.e. Aristotle, who is said to assert in the first book of the *Politics* that the young should be instructed when they are hard and obstinate. A comparison is made with plants: what is rooted in hard ground remains forever. After that reference is made to Aristotle's *Problems*, where the Philosopher is alleged to have said that the nature of boys is hard and what is sown in hard ground is removed with the greatest difficulty. Scholars today refer the *Problems* to pseudo-Aristotle, but that need not be pressed. What is worrisome is that the material claimed for the *Politics* and the *Problems* is not found there. The compiler of *Light of the Soul* may be reporting his source correctly, but if so that source was in error. For our purposes, the important point is that *Light of the Soul* gets Aristotle wrong, and there is little reason to believe that the reports concerning Theophrastus are any better.¹⁴⁷

In regard to Theophrastus, a special problem is the use of the abbreviations "The" and "Theus." They could refer not only to Theophrastus but also to authors like Themistius and Theophilus.¹⁴⁸ In the text-translation volumes, the abbreviation "The" occurs in 268, while "Theus" is found in 283, 285, 287, 288.

In the text-translation volumes, there are 27 passages drawn from *Lumen B*.¹⁴⁹ All but three of the passages have been discussed by Sharples and Huby in their *Commentaries* on physics (3.1), on psychology (4) and on human physiology, living creatures and botany (5). Of the remaining three, 250 will be discussed in the *Commentary* on metaphysics et al. (4) and texts 448 and

¹⁴⁷ See Sharples, *Commentary* 5 (1995) on biology 5 p. 24.

¹⁴⁸ On citations of Theophilus in the *Lumen animae*, see L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University 1934) pp. 553–555. Thorndike concludes, "Thus practically all our author's citations of Theophilus seem incorrect, increasing our suspicion as to his reliability. But if he has invented some of his authorities, it seems less likely that he has merely invented the supposed facts of nature for which he cites them." See also C.R. Dodwell, *Theophilus, De diversis artibus* (London: Nelson 1961) pp. xlv–lii, who agrees that the *Lumen animae* is quite inaccurate in citing Theophilus. Dodwell suggests that the author of the *Lumen* was drawing on a manuscript that began with the *De diversis artibus* of Theophilus and continued with a heterogeneous mass of material from other sources. The change in source was not marked or at least not clearly, so that the author of the *Lumen* took the material to be Theophrastean and attributed it to him (pp. l–lii).

¹⁴⁹ See the list in vol. 2 p. 671.

506 have been discussed in my *Commentary* on ethics (6.1). I departed from the practice of Sharples and Huby who print in the heading to their remarks the warning “Dubious comment on Theophrastus.” Instead, I reserved the warning for the opening sentence of my comments. Moreover, what we are told in 448 is not simply dubious; rather, it is clearly false in that it attributes to Theophrastus a Stoic view that he does not share.¹⁵⁰ Text 506 is more interesting. It too involves error in reporting a Stoic doctrine concerning the passions, but the mention of an unfortunate outcome invites comparison with the fate of Theophrastus’ fellow pupil Callisthenes. See *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 477–478 on 506.

On the titles of books attributed to Theophrastus, see below, Chapter III no. 9a–b pp. 99–101.

3. *Scholia*

17 On Homer]

Homeric scholia for both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have come down to us, but there are many more scholia for the *Iliad*, which is our special concern. These scholia divide into three groups, which are marked by the letters A, bT and D. 1) The A group is fully and best represented by codex Venetus Marcianus Graecus 822 (*olim* 454), whose *siglum* is A. The codex dates to the 10th century, and the scholia therein are written in the margin by a single hand. A subscription occurring at the end of most books tells us that the material presented in the scholia derives from four different works: the *Signs* of Aristonicus (belongs to the Augustan period, a contemporary of Strabo¹⁵¹), *On the Aristarchean Edition* by Didymus (an older contemporary of Aristonicus and nicknamed Chalcenterus, “Brazenbowels”),¹⁵² *Iliadic Prosody* by Herodian (second half of the 2nd century) and *On Punctuation* by Nicanor (first half of the 2nd century).¹⁵³ The sources were not used directly by the scribe

¹⁵⁰ Caveat: in my comment on 448 (p. 283), there is in line 2 a reference to 506. That is a slip, which was not caught during proofreading. The reference should be to 448.

¹⁵¹ See Strabo, *Geography* 1.2.31 (38).

¹⁵² Didymus Chalcenterus also wrote a commentary on the *Odes* of Pindar. See below, this chapter, source no. 18, on the Pindaric scholia. The epithet Χαλκέντερος is a humorous reference to Didymus’ voracious appetite for reading and writing. See the *Suda*, s.v. Δίδυμος = delta no. 872 in *Lexicographi Graeci* vol. 1.2 p. 81 Adler.

¹⁵³ For the Greek text of this subscription together with translation, see G. Nagy, “Homeric Scholia,” in *A New Commentary to Homer*, ed. I. Morris and B. Powell (Leiden: Brill 1997) p. 104; Dickey (2007) p. 19; F. Montanari, “Aristonicus (5)” *Brill’s New Pauly* vol. 1 (2002) col. 1123

who wrote the scholia. His source or rather his source's source will have been a commentary that combined the material found in the four works together with some extra material drawn from other sources. This compilation, made perhaps in the 4th century, is now referred to as the *Viermännerkommentar* or the *quattuorvirum commentarius* or in English the Four-Men Commentary.¹⁵⁴ 2) The group bT acquired its letters from codex Townleianus = Londinensis Bibliothecae Nationalis Burney 86, mid-11th century and codex B = Venetus Marcianus Graecus 821 (*olim* 453), 11th century. The lower case "b" indicates a lost archetype from which B has descended. So have C = codex Venetus Laurentianus 32.3, late 11th or early 12th century, E³ = codex Escorialensis Graecus 291 (y I 1), 11th century, and E⁴ = codex Escorialensis Graecus 509 (Ω I 12), 11th century. 3) The group D has its *siglum* from Didymus, mentioned above, with whom the group is now believed to have no connection. The group is distinct in that a number of manuscripts present the scholia in commentary form as against marginalia. The primary representatives of this group are Z = codex Romanus Bibliothecae Nationalis Graecus 6, 9th century and Q = Vaticanus Graecus 33, 11th century.¹⁵⁵

In the scholia on Homer's *Iliad*, Theophrastus is cited on three occasions. Two concern the twenty-third book, of which the first = 652 is found in codex T and partially in A. It is a comment on 23.269. The funeral pyre of Patroclus has been put out and his bones have been gathered up. Achilles is now organizing games in honor of Patroclus. He begins with the chariot race for which five prizes are listed. Our concern is the prize for fourth place: namely, two talents of gold (23.269), which seems more valuable than all the other prizes. The scholiast asks how that can be (vol. 5 p. 409.71–72 Erbse) and proceeds to name four others who shared his puzzlement. First the scholiast mentions Aristotle, who said that the talent was not a fixed sum among the ancients (fr. 164 Rose³). Next the scholiast mentions Polemarchus (most likely the grammarian of the early 1st century AD), who said that in ancient times the talent was worth four drachmas.¹⁵⁶ Third comes Theophrastus, who said fourteen drachmas, and fourth Timaeus (the

offers the Greek text and "Didymus (1) of Alexandria" *Brill's New Pauly* (2004) col. 396 offers a translation.

¹⁵⁴ In addition to scholars cited in the preceding note, see, e.g., the *praefatio* of M. West, *Homeri Ilias* (Stuttgart: Teubner 1998) p. xi and S. Matthaios, "Four-men Commentary," *Brill's New Pauly* vol. 5 (2004) col. 534.

¹⁵⁵ On the D scholia, see H. van Thiel, "Die D-Scholien der Ilias in den Handschriften," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 132 (2000) pp. 1–62.

¹⁵⁶ C. Wendel, "Polemarchos 3," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 21.1 (1951) col. 1258.

historian and contemporary of Theophrastus), who said twenty-four drachmas.¹⁵⁷ No Theophrastean title is given. Mirhady pp. 230–231 comments that the Theophrastean source “could as easily be one dealing with poetics as with law.” I favor the first possibility (see the end of the immediately following comment on the second scholium), though I agree that a firm decision is not possible.

The second scholium on the twenty-third book (= app. 403) occurs in codices b (BCE³E⁴) and T (vol. 5 p. 421.18–21 Erbse). It is a comment on line 328. Homer is still concerned with the preparations for the chariot race. Three competitors have been identified. They are Eumelus, Diomedes and Menelaus. Now we hear of a fourth. He is Antilochus, the son of Nestor, who is made to address his son, offering advice on how best to handle his horses. In particular, Nestor calls attention to a tree-stump that will serve as a turning-post. He urges Antilochus to control his horses in such a way that they remain close to the post and thereby gain ground on the other teams. Our special interest is the post, which Nestor describes as dry wood, ξύλον αῖον, either of oak or of pine, ἢ δρυὸς ἢ πεύκης, and not rotted by rain, οὐ καταπύθεται ὄμβρῳ (23.327–328). The scholiast picks up on these words (οὐ καταπύθεται is his gloss) and comments, Θεόφραστος φησι τὰ τοιαῦτα ξύλα κατορυσσόμενα ἢ ἐν λίμναις βρεχόμενα μὴ σήπεσθαι· ἐάν δὲ ἐν θαλάσσῃ ᾗ, σήπεται, “Theophrastus says that such woods when buried or soaked in lakes do not rot, but in the sea they rot.” No work of Theophrastus is mentioned, but an obvious candidate is *Research on Plants*, for in that work Theophrastus speaks of oak wood and says that it does not decay (it is ἀσεπές), when buried or soaked in water (5.4.3). Assuming that *Research on Plants* is correct, it is worth noting that the scholiast has not reported in full the passage in question. He ignores the fact that Theophrastus is focused on the different uses that are suitable to different kinds of woods (ἄλλο πρὸς ἄλλο) and that it is oak alone (not oak or pine as in Homer), which is preferred in building ships for use on rivers and lakes. That should remind us that scholia frequently involve abbreviation/simplification, so that as source material scholia must be consulted with caution.

In the text-translation volumes, the scholium is not printed. Rather, it is mentioned in the apparatus to text 403, which is taken from ps.-Alexander of Aprosias’ commentary *On Aristotle’s On Sophistic Refutations*. Ps.-Alexander is discussing Chapter 4, in which Aristotle discusses errors that are unlikely to occur in spoken conversation but do occur in written texts

¹⁵⁷ Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F 143a.

due to the absence of accents (166b1–9). Following Aristotle, the commentator focuses on “ου” in Homer’s *Iliad* 23.328, τὸ μὲν οὐ καταπύθεται ὄμβρῳ, arguing that it would be a mistake to read οὐ and not οὐ. Like Aristotle,¹⁵⁸ he cites Hippias of Thasus,¹⁵⁹ who supported reading οὐ. After that, he cites Theophrastus as follows: λέγει δὲ Θεόφραστος τὸ φυτὸν τῆς πεύκης ὄμβρῳ ὕδασι καὶ πηγαίοις μὴ σήπεσθαι, θαλαττίοις δὲ μάλιστα, “Theophrastus says that the pine tree is not rotted by rain water and spring water, but is very much rotted by sea water” (CAG vol. 2.3 p. 33.29–34.2 Wallies). At first reading one may wonder why the citation makes no explicit reference to lexical confusion due to absence of accents, and why it fails to mention a word like “ου” which opens the door to misunderstanding. On reflection, however, there is a simple answer. Ps-Alexander cites Theophrastus as a general witness regarding water not causing rot. As stated above, in *Research on Plants* Theophrastus says that a wood like oak is immune to rot, ἀσπεές, in certain waters, so that Hippias and Aristotle are doing nothing odd when they read οὐ, “not,” in *Iliad* 23.328.

A further concern is whether ps. Alexander’s citation of Theophrastus goes back to *Research on Plants*. If it does, then we must allow that pseudo-Alexander has not reported Theophrastus with complete accuracy. Indeed, he gets Theophrastus wrong in regard to type of tree and source of water. Mentioning the pine tree and rain invites comparison with Homer and not Theophrastus. That might be explained by the fact that ps.-Alexander has his eye on *Iliad* 23.328, so that without thinking he transfers details found in Homer to Theophrastus. But a different explanation suggests itself. Aristotle discusses the Homeric passage in connection with mistakes due to accent not only in *Sophistic Refutations* but also in the *Poetics*. Perhaps, then, ps.-Alexander’s report concerning Theophrastus does not go back to *Research on Plants*. It may go back to a work like *On (the Art of) Poetry* (666 no. 20 and 21). Aristotle discussed the Homeric line within a chapter on problems (25 1461a21–23), and Theophrastus may have done the same. Alternatively, the work *Collection of Problems* (727 no. 3) may have included literary problems alongside physical and other kinds of problems. I prefer the former possibility, for it is easy to imagine a chapter that repeats some of the material found

¹⁵⁸ Ps.-Alexander erroneously cites the *Rhetoric* (p. 33.27); *Poetics* 25 1461a23 is correct.

¹⁵⁹ Hippias of Thasus is otherwise unknown. An attempt to eliminate him through emendation (turn him into Hippias of Elis) has not won acceptance. See J. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: University Press 1903) p. 28 and G. Funaioli, “Hippias 16” in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 8 (1913) col. 1712.

in Aristotle's *Poetics*, including a chapter in which mention is made of pine and rain as found in the *Iliad*. But there is no certainty here. I leave the issue undecided.

There remains another scholion on Homer's *Iliad*. It is concerned with the first book, line 449 = 730 and not only names Theophrastus but also refers to the work *On Discoveries* = 727 no. 11. The subject of the scholium is barley-groats and the grinding of grain. We have printed the text of the scholium that is found in codex A and three other codices. A variant is found in codex C.¹⁶⁰ The scholium is not printed by Harmut Erbse in his edition of the scholia.¹⁶¹ On 730, see the discussion below, Chapter IV "The Texts," and on 727 no. 11 see Chapter III "Titles of Books."

18 On Pindar]

Pindar (c. 520–440 BC), the greatest of the lyric poets and the person who perfected the victory ode, wrote an elaborate verse that often challenges the reader in regard to meter, style and content. It is, therefore, not surprising that during the Hellenistic period scholars in Alexandria took a keen interest in the odes, on which they wrote commentaries. Subsequently the commentaries became the basis of the scholia that have survived, albeit abbreviated, in the margins of extant manuscripts of Pindar's *Odes*.¹⁶² The commentary of Didymus Chalcenterus (c. 80–10 BC) merits special mention, for this commentary was the primary source on which the scholiasts drew¹⁶³ and which itself incorporated material from earlier interpreters of Pindar.¹⁶⁴ The resulting scholia are called "old" to distinguish them from more recent Byzantine scholia.

The scholia divide into those that focus on the meters of Pindar's odes and those that are exegetical. The former are based on metrical analyses made by Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 257–180 BC). The lines are quite short

¹⁶⁰ W. Leaf in the introduction to his edition of the *Iliad* (London: Macmillan 1886) p. xvii characterizes codex C as "a valuable MS. with a good many peculiar readings, though rather carelessly written." In making this assessment, he does not mention the scholia.

¹⁶¹ *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter 1969) pp. 125–126.

¹⁶² Here and elsewhere in this comment I am largely dependent upon Drachmann (1903) pp. v–xxi and (1910) pp. v–xvi, Gudeman (1923) col. 647–652, Race (1997) pp. 1–41 and Dickey (2007) pp. 38–40.

¹⁶³ According to Gudeman (1923) col. 649, Didymus is mentioned c. 60 times in the scholia and was used much more often. Franco Montanari, "Didymus [2] of Alexandria" in *Brill's New Pauly* vol. 4 (Leiden 2004) col. 396–397 says c. 80.

¹⁶⁴ Gudeman (1923) col. 649 names Aristophanes, Aristarchus, Crates, Callistratus, Aristodemus, Ammonius, and Aristonicus.

and do not represent the true colometry of Pindar. A correct understanding of Pindar's metrical divisions was first achieved in the nineteenth century; it divides the odes into longer and therefore fewer lines. Together the two analyses give rise to competing sets of line numbers. In this comment and in the discussion of text 734 (below, Chapter IV), I give both numbers in commenting on a particular line or lines.¹⁶⁵

The exegetical scholia go back to Didymus Chalcenterus and through him to Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 217–145 BC) and other early commentators. The scholia were abbreviated in the 2nd century AD and are largely free of late additions.¹⁶⁶ Many of the reports and comments on matters of history and mythology are important for understanding the odes and some are thought to go back to Pindar's own time. But there are also unverifiable conjectures and imaginative interpretations that may or may not be correct. As an example, I cite a scholium on the thirteenth *Olympian Ode*. Pindar's subject is Xenophon of Corinth, who has been a double winner in the Olympic games. After the briefest reference to the victor's house as gentle to townsmen and hospitable to foreigners, Pindar turns to magnify the achievements of the Corinthians, and toward this end he puts forth several questions: From where did the delights of Dionysus come (26–27 = 18–19)? Who added the bit or restrainer to the horses' gear (28 = 20)? "Who added the twin king of the birds to the temples of the gods?" (τίς θεῶν ναοῖσιν οἰωνῶν βασιλέα δίδυμον ἐπέθηκ'; (29–30 = 21–22). The answer to the last question (as well as the two preceding) is the Corinthians,¹⁶⁷ but the phrase "twin king of the birds" is not immediately clear. If we look to the scholia for clarity, we find two quite different explanations, numbered 29a and 29b in Drachmann's edition of the scholia. First we are told that the king of the birds is the eagle, ἀετός, and in regard to the temples of the gods, the reference is to the gable, ἀέτωμα. Pindar says "twin," because there are two gables, back and front. That is 29a (p. 363.17–364.1 Drachmann), which is found in five codices: B (Vaticanus Graecus 1312, end of 12th century), C (Parisinus Graecus 2774, c. 1300), D (Laurentianus 32.52, 14th century), E (Laurentianus 32.37, c. 1300)

¹⁶⁵ Dickey (2007) pp. 38–39 with note 23. Race (1997) p. 38 refers succinctly to "the monumental edition of August Boeckh, which first set forth the division of Pindar's verse into periods rather than cola."

¹⁶⁶ I have written "largely," because the scholia are not entirely free of late additions. For an example, I cite Gudeman (1923) pp. 650–651, who argues that a scholium on *Olympian Ode* 3.53 is a later interpolation taken from a collection of curiosities and marvels.

¹⁶⁷ Regarding Pindar's praise of a victor's homeland, see E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte*, Bd. 1 (Heidelberg: Winter 1968) pp. 55–65; on *Olympian Ode* 13, see p. 59, 64.

and Q (Laurentianus 32.35, c. 1300). The explanation is not foolish. In architecture, the word ἀετός can be used for a gable or pediment (LSJ s.v. ἀετός III), and the gable of a temple may be thought to resemble an eagle with its wings spread.¹⁶⁸ A second explanation, 29b, is added in two of the five codices: namely in E and Q. The king of the birds, we are told, is the eagle which is placed on the temples: ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τιθέμενος (p. 364.1–3 D). The scholium is referring to the two eagles that were placed as finials, ἀκρωτήρια, atop the two gables of a temple.¹⁶⁹ In my judgment, this second explanation is likely to be the correct explanation, but I leave the matter undecided.

Below, in Chapter IV on “The Texts,” I shall discuss a scholium on the second of the three questions listed above (that regarding a horse’s bit), for it mentions Theophrastus. It is text 734. In this place, I want to add a word concerning a scholium on *Pythian Ode* 2.2 (p. 32.13–19 D), text 586, in which Theophrastus is named and a work *On Etruscans* is cited (line 5). Since the ode is placed among the Pythian odes and since it makes explicit reference to Hiero and his four-horse chariot (2.8–9 = 4–5),¹⁷⁰ it is natural to assume that the ode celebrates Hiero’s victory in a chariot race at the Pythian games, which will have been held on the plain of Crisa in the vicinity of Delphi. But the date of the victory is uncertain and even the venue has been called into question.¹⁷¹

Our special concern is what the scholiast says concerning the phrase βαθυπολέμου τέμενος Ἄρεος, “sanctuary of Ares deep in war.” The phrase occurs at the beginning of the ode, where the city of Syracuse is described as great, a sanctuary of Ares, and divine nurturer of men and horses (2.1–2). The phrase is quoted as a lemma, after which the scholiast tells us that Pindar used the phrase for two reasons. First, the forces of Gelon and Hiero had recently defeated the Carthaginians, Libyans and Etruscans, who had sailed against the island, i.e., Sicily. Second, Carthage had come under their control. At least Theophrastus says in *On Etruscans* that on Gelon’s order they stopped performing human sacrifice (lines 1–6 = p. 32.13–19 D). The report concerning Theophrastus is followed by one in which Timaeus is

¹⁶⁸ A. Puech, *Pindare* vol. 1 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1970) p. 149 n. 2. S. Instone in A. Verity, *Pindar, The Complete Odes* (Oxford: University Press) p. 153 explains the twin eagles as “an allusion to a temple’s triangular (wing-shaped) twin pediments.”

¹⁶⁹ Gildersleeve (1890) pp. 230–231 and Race (1997) p. 191 n. 3.

¹⁷⁰ The ode carries the heading “For Hiero of Syracuse, Winner of the Chariot Race.”

¹⁷¹ See Race (1997) p. 229 and Instone, op. cit. p. 156. Since the ode celebrates not only Hiero but also the city of Corinth, it is reasonable to assume that the victory occurred after Hiero became tyrant of Syracuse in 478 BC. According to Gildersleeve (1890) p. 252, the victory was not at the Pythian games but at the Theban Iolaia, probably in 477.

cited for the statement that he (Gelon) also ordered them to contribute money (p. 32.19–20). Both reports may have come to the scholiast through Didymus Chalcenterus, but they are to be kept separate: the report concerning Timaeus has not been printed as part of 586 in the text-translation volumes.

The first part of the scholium (lines 1–3) can be confusing. When we read that the Carthaginians and Libyans and Etruscans had recently sailed against the island and been defeated by the forces of Gelon and Hiero, we might think of a single battle in which Carthaginians and generally the people of Libya¹⁷² joined forces with the Etruscans of southern Italy, sailed together against Sicily and were defeated by the combined forces of Gelon and Hiero. Moreover, placement of *μη μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καί* may add to the confusion. Since Gelon and Hiero are mentioned before *μη μόνον*, it might be thought that both men are to be understood with what is reported after *ἀλλὰ καί*, i.e., in the second part of the scholium (lines 4–6). But that would be a mistake. Properly understood, the first part conflates two victories that occurred six years apart. In 480 BC, Gelon together with Theron defeated the Carthaginians at Himera on the northern coast of Sicily. Hiero may have participated as the viceroy of Gela, but we are not told that he did. What we do know is that later in 474 BC Hiero decisively defeated the Etruscan fleet off Cyme on the west coast of Italy. That victory is likely to have been mentioned in Theophrastus' work *On Etruscans* (589 no. 23). But Gelon will not have participated, for he died in 478, after which Hieron became tyrant of Syracuse. I conclude that the first part of the scholium may be confusing in that it conflates two Greek victories, but in saying that I do not want to attribute the conflation to Theophrastus. Most likely it occurred centuries after his time, when scholiasts took over and abbreviated material found in the commentaries of Alexandrian scholars like Didymus Chalcenterus.

Turning to the second part of the scholium (lines 4–6), we can say that it concerns Gelon's victory over the Carthaginians. His injunction against human sacrifice belongs to 480 and not to 474 when Hieron defeated the Etruscans. Plutarch has that right. In *Sayings of Kings and Commanders*, we read of Gelon defeating the Carthaginians at Himera and including in the peace treaty that the Carthaginians will give up sacrificing children to Cronus, i.e., Baal, (175A). In *On Delays in Divine Vengeance*, Plutarch mentions Gelon and

¹⁷² Or taking *Καρχηδονίους καὶ Λίβυας* as hendiadys, the "Carthaginians of Libya."

Hiero together in regard to a change from harsh rule to mild, but then names only Gelon in regard to victory over the Carthaginians and the prohibition of sacrificing children (551F–552A).

In *On Abstinence from Eating Animals* 2.56.5 (CB vol. 2 p. 118.23–119.1 Bouffartique), Porphyry speaks of Iphicrates stopping the sacrifice of children at Carthage. Most likely that is an error,¹⁷³ but it is at least possible that Iphicrates played a subordinate role alongside Gelon, or that Gelon's prohibition did not last and Iphicrates put a stop to the practice for a second time.¹⁷⁴ Whatever the truth concerning Iphicrates, it seems that Gelon's injunction was not permanent and perhaps lasted for only a short time. I cite an earlier passage in Porphyry's *On Abstinence*, in particular 2.27.2 = 584A.282–286, where we read, “From then (the beginning of human sacrifice) until now, not only in Arcadia at the festival of the Lycaean Zeus and in Carthage at the festival of Cronus do they all make public sacrifice of human beings, but also periodically in remembrance of the custom they sprinkle the altars with kindred blood.”¹⁷⁵ If we are dealing with an excerpt from Theophrastus' *On Piety* (as I think we are) and if the “now” refers to Theophrastus' time,¹⁷⁶ then it would seem that the prohibition of Gelon did not last. And if the quoted words are taken quite literally, then the practice of human sacrifice at Carthage continued without interruption (“from the beginning until now” 584A.282–283), and that would seem to tell against Gelon's prohibition. Or perhaps the prohibition had such a short life that Theophrastus chose to ignore it in an exoteric writing, especially in a dialogue, as *On Piety* is likely to have been.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷³ See, e.g., J. Bouffartique, *Porphyre, De l'abstinence* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1979) vol. 2 p. 118 n. 14. He thinks that naming Iphicrates is a simple mistake: in fact it was Gelon who put a stop to the practice.

¹⁷⁴ In W. Pape and G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 3rd ed., vol. 1 (Braunschweig: Vieweg 1911) p. 581 col. 1, the authors query whether the Iphicrates referred to by Porphyry, spelled -ις, might be the Athenian military commander (c. 415–353 BC, so S. Usher in the Loeb edition of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, vol. 1 p. 43 n. 1) and father of a like named son (Arrian, *Anabasis* 2.15.2, 4).

¹⁷⁵ Human sacrifice is first mentioned at 584A.78.

¹⁷⁶ Regarding “now,” νῦν, as used in 584A, see below, the introduction to Chapter IV p. 137 n. 7 (on 2.7.1 = 47).

¹⁷⁷ While I am inclined to believe that *On Piety* was a dialogue, I want to acknowledge that there is disagreement among scholars. See C. Gorteman, “Un fragment du Περὶ εὐσεβείας de Théophraste dans le P. Petrie II 49e?” *Chronique d'Égypte* 33 (1958) p. 96, F. Wehrli, *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* 18 (1965) p. 223 and H. Gottschalk, “Rezension von Pötscher, *Theophrastos Περὶ εὐσεβείας*,” *Gnomon* 41 (1969) 344, who regard *On Piety* as a dialogue; W. Pötscher, *Theophrastos, ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΣ* = *Philosophia Antiqua*, Bd. 11 (Leiden 1964) p. 13 opposes that view.

Diodorus of Sicily tells us that human sacrifice was practiced at Carthage in 310 BC (during the lifetime of Theophrastus, who died in 286). Babbitt speaks of the practice being “revived in 310 BC, even if it had not persisted during the intervening years.”¹⁷⁸ Perhaps, but Diodorus does not tell us that human sacrifice had died out. What he says is that the Carthaginians had suffered at serious defeat at the hands of the Greeks and that they thought the gods responsible for their misfortune. As a result they undertook to increase their offerings to the gods and that included sending money and golden shrines to the gods of Tyre, their homeland. In addition they thought that Cronus was angry for they had ceased sacrificing the finest of their sons and were secretly substituting children whom they had purchased. By way of remediation, they selected two hundred of their own children, whom they sacrificed publicly. Three hundred others sacrificed themselves voluntarily. That is extraordinary, but as reported it would be more accurate to say that the Carthaginians reformed their practice of human sacrifice than that they revived it. And if we combine Diodorus’ report with what we read in 584A.282–286, it seems reasonable to doubt the effectiveness of Gelon’s injunction against human sacrifice. It may have had the desired effect for a period of time, perhaps quite short, after which the Carthaginians reverted to their former practices.

In the scholium, Theophrastus is cited only in regard to Gelon’s prohibition of human sacrifice at Carthage. That may seem to be at variance with citing Theophrastus’ work *On Etruscans*, but we know so little about the work (it is referred to only in text 586) that I prefer not to dwell on what may be only an apparent awkwardness. Difficulties with the Carthaginians and the Etruscans were contemporaneous, so that a work carrying the title *On Etruscans* might have more than one occasion not only to refer to Gelon but also to mention his prohibition of human sacrifice. Or the title *On Etruscans* may be an abbreviation of a longer title that made reference to the Carthaginians and generally to peoples who were hostile to the western Greeks. Others can add other possibilities.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ F.C. Babbitt, *Plutarch’s Moralia* vol. 3 = Loeb vol. 245 (London: Heinemann 1931) p. 27 n. e.

¹⁷⁹ Usener p. 21 thought that *On Etruscans* (589 no. 23) was part of *On Piety* (580 no. 3). R. Dareste, *La science du droit en Grèce* (Paris 1893) p. 293 and J. Bernays, *Theophrastos’ Schrift über Frömmigkeit* (Breslau 1866) p. 189 have suggested *Laws* (589 no. 17). Mirhady, Diss. 1992 p. 95 is uncommitted.

19 On Euripides

The surviving tragedies of Euripides (c. 480–406 BC) number eighteen,¹⁸⁰ for nine of which scholia of varying length are extant. These scholia divide into two groups: the so-called old scholia and the Byzantine scholia. The latter are of value primarily for persons interested in the Byzantine period: the history of the text and scholarship on the tragedies during that period. The former, the old scholia, are of greater interest and value in that they go back to the work of Aristophanes of Byzantium, who was head of the Alexandrian library at the beginning of the second century BC. He wrote introductions to the Euripidean tragedies, established their colometry and provided other information presumably through notes and lectures. Subsequently other Alexandrians wrote commentaries on the tragedies, which were drawn on by Didymus Chalcenterus, who produced a composite commentary toward the end of the first century BC. A note to the scholia tells us that they derive from the commentaries of Didymus and Dionysius, the latter being otherwise unknown to us. No information in the scholia appears to post-date the middle of the third century AD.¹⁸¹

The old scholia contain valuable information for establishing the Greek text of the Euripidean tragedies, but they include much more such as the production and staging of the tragedies, lexicographical and mythological information, as well as paraphrases from school editions. Our particular concern is with a scholium that focuses on the proverb *Μηδὲν ἄγαν*, “Nothing in excess,” which is spoken by the Nurse in Euripides’ *Hippolytus* 265. The scholium is not concerned with textual issues: the proverb was well established and appears as it usually does. Rather, the scholium is concerned with varying attributions of the proverb: Some persons like Critias attribute it to Chilo, others to Sodamus, and Theophrastus to Sisyphus and Pittheus. For discussion I refer to the commentary on 738.5 in Chapter IV pp. 220–225. Here I limit myself to a single observation: the scholium not only illustrates the fact that proverbs are movable in the sense that they are frequently assigned to more than one individual, but also points up the need to distinguish between attributing a proverb to an individual as its originator and referring a proverb to someone who used the proverb, perhaps because it was already well-known and therefore would have a special/predictable effect on the listener or reader.

¹⁸⁰ The number includes the *Rhesus* whose authenticity is doubtful.

¹⁸¹ Dickey pp. 32–33.

20 On Apollonius of Rhodes

Apollonius belongs to the third century BC. He was a pupil of Callimachus and director of the library in Alexandria. He quarreled with his teacher over the fundamentals of epic poetry and removed himself to Rhodes. Subsequently a reconciliation may have occurred; at least, there is a tradition that Apollonius was buried together with Callimachus.¹⁸²

Apollonius is best known for his epic poem entitled *Argonautica*, which tells of the Argonauts' recovery of the golden fleece. The poem is not simple: it involves Homeric diction and frequent displays of learning, which provided ample meat for commentators including Theon of Alexandria (1st century BC), Lucillus of Tarrha (1st century AD) and Sophocleus the grammarian (2nd century AD). Their commentaries are said to stand behind the scholia that have come down to us in manuscripts of the *Argonautica*. See the end of Carl Wendel's edition of the scholia (1935: p. 329.8–9), which has been reprinted together with a French translation by Guy Lachenaud (2010: pp. 528–529).¹⁸³ There the letter "L" indicates that the scholium in question is to be found in codex Laurentianus Gr. 32.9, which dates to the second half of the tenth or early eleventh century AD. The transmission of the scholia divides into several branches that are variously described in the scholarly literature. There is a first branch whose principle representative is codex L (details above). Closely related to L is codex A = Ambrosianus 120 (B 98 sup), 15th century. In the literature, it has been treated both as a distinct branch and as a member of the branch to which L belongs. In addition, there are codex S = Laurentianus Gr. 32.16, which is representative of a distinct branch, and codex P = codex Parisinus 2727, 16th century, which Lachenaud regards as representative of a branch subordinate to that codex S.¹⁸⁴ For fuller discussion see the literature listed below.¹⁸⁵

Five scholia name Theophrastus. In one case (413 no. 64), the scholiast is focused on *Argonautica* 1.879: ὥς δ' ὅτε λείρια καλὰ περιβρομέουσι μέλισσαι, "as when bees buzz round beautiful lilies," The scholiast first says that generally

¹⁸² See the Ἀπολλωνίου βίος, "Life of Apollonius," in C. Wendel, *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera* (Berlin: Weidmann 1935, repr. 1958) p. 2.13–14.

¹⁸³ Regarding Wendel's edition, see the preceding note. Lachenaud's edition is *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2011).

¹⁸⁴ Lachenaud, op. cit. p. xv.

¹⁸⁵ G. Mooney, *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (London: Longmans 1912) pp. 56–60, Wendel, op. cit. pp. x–xvii, H. Fränkel, *Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe der Argonautika des Apollonios* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1964) pp. 92–110, Dickey (2007) pp. 62–63 and Lachenaud, op. cit. pp. xiii–xv.

flowers are called λείρια and then adds that there is a flower specifically called λείριον, and Theophrastus says in *On Plants* that the narcissus is spoken of in this way, but others say the white lily. The Theophrastean reference is to *Research on Plants* 6.6.9, where νάρκισσος and λείριον are treated as alternative names.¹⁸⁶

A second scholium (413 no. 54) is focused on *Argonautica* 4.200, where the phrase πηδοῖσι ἐρέσσετε, “row with (ply the) oars,” is found. The scholiast first explains πηδός as the flat of the blade of an oar; Apollonius has used the part for the whole. After that the scholiast cites Theophrastus and says that πηδός is a kind of wood. Here the scholiast does not refer to a particular Theophrastean work, but it is clear that the scholiast’s comment is based on *Research on Plants* 5.7.6, where Theophrastus lists a variety of woods including πηδός, which is said to be used for the axles of wagons and the stocks of ploughs. One is tempted to say that this scholium and that which is discussed above go back to the same source and that taken together they suggest that the several reports concerning Theophrastus are reliable. But that would be hasty, for it is not certain that the two scholia are based on one and the same commentary,¹⁸⁷ and since the scholia derive from at least three sources, we cannot assume on the basis of two reports that all five reports are equally reliable. Different sources are possible and their reliability may vary.

A third scholium (196A) is a comment on *Argonautica* 4.834: “εἰ μὲν δὴ μαλεροῖο πυρός, “If indeed (the force) of the raging fire (will cease).” The words are spoken by Thetis, who is responding to Hera’s request that she protect the ship of the Argonauts as it voyages along the southwest coast of Italy and past the Aeolian Islands, where Hephaestus has his forge.¹⁸⁸ Hera has expressed confidence that Hephaestus will stop stoking his raging fire and Hippotas’ son Aeolus will control the winds (4.818–821). Thetis’ response is positive, though she begins cautiously with the if-clause cited by the scholiast. In what follows on the lemma, the scholiast comments, “In the region of the strait, fire is vented up in the sea, so that the sea

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 15.27 680E, where we read that in Book 6 of *On Plants*, Theophrastus says that the narcissus is also called λείριον. Athenaeus, who was born c. 200AD, postdates the three authors named as sources of the scholia. For their dates, see above.

¹⁸⁷ I note that only one of the scholia names a Theophrastean work, but the difference is minor and may depend upon a scholiast who has abbreviated the material in one case and not in another.

¹⁸⁸ The Aeolian Islands, known today as the Lipari Islands, are situated off the north coast of Sicily and include the islands of Stromboli and Vulcano.

too is warm, as Metrodorus says in his first book *On Research* (FGrH 184 F 2)¹⁸⁹ and Theophrastus in his *Research Memoranda* (727 no. 7). And he (Theophrastus) says that the roar from the Aeolian Islands can be heard for up to a thousand stades away; at any rate, around Tauromenium a sound like thunder is heard" (p. 295.24–296.4 W).

The scholium may be divided into two parts.¹⁹⁰ In the first, Metrodorus and Theophrastus are cited regarding a venting of fire around the strait. We should think of an underwater volcano that is in the vicinity of the Strait of Messina. To my knowledge, this underwater volcano is not reported elsewhere, but that may only reflect the poverty of the surviving sources. Alternatively, the report may be erroneous. For as P.J. Keyser informs me,¹⁹¹ no modern geologist seems to have found an underwater volcano in or near the Strait of Messina. The second part begins with καὶ φησι, "And he says." It focuses on noise originating in the Aeolian Islands, which are northwest of the Strait of Messina. It is natural to associate the singular φησι with Theophrastus (the last named) and not Metrodorus, but one may wonder whether that is correct. Be that as it may, the noise is said to be heard, ἀκούεσθαι, up to 1000 stades away, i.e., c. 115 miles. That is a considerable distance but perhaps appropriate to the forge of Hephaestus. There are, however, difficulties. First, the verb ἀκούεσθαι, "to be heard" is an emendation. The codices offer καίεσθαι, "to burn" which is printed by Wimmer, who translates it as if it were a genitive participle with τοῦ πυρός: *ignis ardentis*. But in fact, the subject of the infinitive is βρόμον, "noise" or "roar." Perhaps a poet might transfer καίεσθαι from fire to noise, but I doubt that Theophrastus would have done so.¹⁹² A second and more worrisome difficulty is the distance 1000 stades. That is an emendation, which would place the source of noise well beyond the Aeolian Islands. The reading of the manuscripts, ἐνὸς

¹⁸⁹ The Metrodorus mentioned here is Metrodorus of Scepsis. According to Schissel, "Metrodorus 23" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 15 (1932) col. 1481, he was born c. 150 BC. D. Dueck, "Metrodorus of Scepsis," in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists*, ed. Paul J. Keyser and Georgia L. Irby-Massie (2008) p. 555 sets his floruit as 100 to 70 BC. His work *On Research*, which ran at least four books, will have contained numerous geographical reports.

¹⁹⁰ In his own way, Wimmer divides the text into two parts. He omits the first part of the scholium and prints in its place the parallel text found in Antigonus, *Collection of Amazing Stories* 130 = fr. 164 W = 196B. He prints the second part of the scholium (with the last words of the first part) as fr. 165 W = 196A.

¹⁹¹ Paul J. Keyser in private correspondence with me.

¹⁹² Keyser suggests that before corruption, the text may have said, "the fire from the Aeolian Isles burns up to one stade away (from the island)." That would be worth noting, for it tells us that "the lava flows as far as a stade into the sea."

σταδίου, “one stade,” is equally troubling, for there would be nothing remarkable about hearing a noise associated with volcanic activity at one stade or 606 feet. What follows might be thought helpful, for it seems consciously to reduce the distance of 1000 stades (*if* that is the correct reading): “at any rate, around Tauromenium a sound like thunder is heard.” But even if Tauromenium is only c. 50 miles from the Aeolian Islands as the crow flies, it is also a good distance down the west coast of Sicily, so that noise coming from the Aeolian Islands would have to pass east over elevated portions of Sicily, which is problematic. Keyser has suggested that the noise heard at Tauromenium is more likely to come from nearby Aetna or from the Straits of Messina. That is quite plausible and might well have been stated clearly in one of the commentaries from which the scholia derive. But the scholium in question almost certainly involves serious abbreviation, so that the issue concerning distance is likely to remain unresolved.

Finally, we should keep in mind that the Theophrastean work cited in the scholium is *Research Memoranda*. Most likely this work contained not only reports to which Theophrastus himself could attest, but also second hand reports which may or may not have come to Theophrastus from a reliable witness. In some cases, Theophrastus may have added words of caution or doubt, while in other cases he may have recorded the reports without comment. Perhaps the Theophrastean material in 196A is a truncated version of a second hand report that was recorded without words of caution.

A fourth scholium (374) is focused on *Argonautica* 1.972, where the word ῥουλος occurs. The scholion names Theophrastus and refers to his letter to Phainias (727 no. 16b).¹⁹³ The letter may have been part of a collection of letters referred to in Diogenes Laertius’ catalogue of Theophrastean writings, for in that catalogue, both *Letters*, 3 books (5.46 = 1.92 = 727 no. 15) and *Letters to Astycreon, Phainias, Nicanor* (5.50 = 1.276 = 727 no. 16a) occur. How the two titles relate to each other is uncertain (the two have been thought to refer to the same work, but that cannot be proven¹⁹⁴), and how the letter referred to by the scholiast relates to the works listed by Diogenes is also uncertain. That said, there is no strong reason to doubt what the scholion reports concerning Theophrastus. After telling us that ῥουλος is the name of a little creature with many legs (the wood-louse), the scholiast continues,

¹⁹³ Text 374 is fragment 5 in Engels’ collection of the fragments of Phainias. Sharples discusses 374 briefly in *Commentary* 5 on biology (1995) pp. 104–105, and I do the same in a forthcoming article (2015: see below, p. 255) on the relation between Phainias and Theophrastus.

¹⁹⁴ See below, Chapter 3, “Titles of Books,” on 727 no. 15 and 16a–b.

"In his letter to Phainias, Theophrastus says that it (the wood-louse) is also called ὄνος ('ass'), as in Sophocles' *Dumb Satyrs*: 'rolled up like some ὄνος similar to a bean'" (374.2–4).¹⁹⁵ Theophrastus mentions the wood-louse in *Research on Plants* 4.3.6 and may have wished to share with Phainias some information concerning the wood-louse, but he might be responding to a question put by Phainias. Be that as it may, there is no good reason to doubt what the scholiast reports, albeit at second hand through some source like the three named above.¹⁹⁶

The fifth scholium to name Theophrastus focuses on *Argonautica* 2.1248–1250 = 729. It tells us that Theophrastus spoke of Prometheus as wise: the first person to give men a share in philosophy, and for that reason he is said to have given men a share in fire. I shall discuss this text below in Chapter 4 on "The Texts."

Before concluding this discussion of scholia on Apollonius' *Argonautica*, I want to call attention to a scholium that concerns 1.1129–1130. The scholium mentions Hephaestus' art, which relates closely to the gift of fire. It also takes us back to an epic poem entitled *Phoronis*, which was written early in the sixth century.¹⁹⁷ The poem has its title from Phoroneus, the putative ancestor of the Argives, who is said to have been the father of mortal men (Clemens, *Patchwork* 1.21 102.6), the most ancient of Greek kings (Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 7.193, cf. 194) and the discoverer and conveyor of fire to men (Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 2.19.5). The scholium first speaks of the Idaean Dactyls,¹⁹⁸ who are said to have been sorcerers and magicians and the first persons to be iron-workers and miners: γόητες μὲν ἦσαν καὶ φαρμακεῖς καὶ δημιουργικοὶ σιδήρου λέγονται πρῶτοι καὶ μεταλλεῖς γενέσθαι (p. 101.10–12). In what follows, several verses of the *Phoronis* are cited. The poet speaks of Phrygian sorcerers, names Celmis, Damnameneus and Acmon¹⁹⁹ and says that they were first to discover the art of many skilled Hephaestus: οἱ πρῶτοι τέχνην πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο εὗρον (p. 102.1–12). The verses quoted from the *Phoronis*, are of interest for several reasons. In them we have the earliest explicit reference to first discoverers, πρῶτοι εὑρεταί (*re vera* πρῶτοι εὗρον).

¹⁹⁵ Sophocles, TrGF fr. 363.

¹⁹⁶ See p. 60.

¹⁹⁷ Kleingüntner (1933) p. 26 says the first half of the sixth century; Zhmud (2006) p. 24 says the first third of the sixth century.

¹⁹⁸ Δάκτυλοι Ἰδαίου, Fingers of Ida, is the lemma, p. 101.8 Wendel.

¹⁹⁹ The three proper names (p. 102.5 W) reflect an early connection with metallurgy: Celmis = Κέλμις = Casting; Damnameneus = Δαμναμενεύς = Hammer; Acmon = Ἀκμων = Anvil.

In addition, the discovery of working with iron is not attributed to a god.²⁰⁰ Rather it is attributed to three mythological figures, who were originally conceived of as dwarfs that engaged in metallurgy.²⁰¹ Now in the *Phoronis*, they are no longer dwarfish. Damnameneus is said to be large, μέγας, and Acmon is said to be of overwhelming strength, ὑπέρβιος. Furthermore, they are spoken of as Ἰδαῖοι Φρύγες ἄνδρες, i.e., men who live in the region of Phrygian Ida, a mountain range in the Troad, northwestern Asia Minor.²⁰² That invites comparison with text 731, in which Theophrastus is said to have attributed working with copper to Delas the Phrygian. Both texts make clear the importance of Asia Minor in the development of metallurgy. See Chapter IV “The Texts” on 731.

4. Arabic Sources

21 Ibn-an-Nadīm] fl. 987 AD

The invaluable Baghdad bookseller, scribe, and bibliographer Ibn-an-Nadīm, to whose diligence we owe our knowledge of a good number of medieval Arabic books that have not survived, compiled his *Index (Al-Fihrist)* in 987. He was friends with fellow scribe Yahyā ibn-ʿAdī (d. 974), the leader of the Baghdad Aristotelian philosophers, from whom he received a

²⁰⁰ Caveat: I am not saying that attributing the discovery of metallurgy to the Idaean Dactyls rules out divine patronage. Indeed, the text of the *Phoronis* suggests the opposite: οἱ πρῶτοι τέχνην πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο εὔρον.

²⁰¹ See above, note 199.

²⁰² Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 7.197 tells us that Hesiod attributes working with iron to the Idaean Dactyls in Crete. No such Hesiodic passage has survived and the report most likely reflects a confusion concerning the two Idas: that on Crete and that in Phrygia. Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.16 75.4 says that the Idaean Dactyls, Celmis and Damnameneus, discovered iron on Cyprus. Another Idaean, Delas, found the alloy of bronze; according to Hesiod, he was Scythes or a Scythian (cf. 731). Again no Hesiodic passage survives. In A. Rzach, *Hesiodus, Carmina* (Teubner 1958 = repr. ed. 1913) pp. 199–200 the two texts appear as fr. 176.—Zhmod opposes seeing in the Phrygian Dactyls a reminiscence of how the Hittites discovered the smelting of iron. He observes that a poet in Argos in the early sixth century would neither know what the Hittites had accomplished nor have taken an interest in it (p. 25). Much the same might be said concerning Glaucus of Chios, who was roughly contemporary with the author of the *Phoronis* (both belong to the early sixth century). According to Herodotus, Glaucus invented iron soldering and produced a silver crater that rested on an iron stand. The crater was dedicated in Delphi by Alyattes, the King of Lydia (*Histories* 1.25). It is most unlikely that the author of the *Phoronis* will have been aware of or even interested in the work of Glaucus, on whom see Kleingünther pp. 24–25, 50–51 and Zhmod (2001) p. 18 and (2006) p. 29.

good part of his information about philosophical books and translations. On the basis of this information and his own knowledge of the market of manuscripts, he compiled the list of Theophrastus' works that we have (3A).

22 Abū-l-Farağ Ibn-aṭ-Ṭayyib] d. 1043AD

The Nestorian theologian and churchman, Baghdad hospital physician, and philosopher Abū-l-Farağ was one of the last representatives of the Baghdad Aristotelians. He was a prolific author of a traditional mold on all the subjects of his professional concerns and wrote much in the way of commentaries and paraphrases that preserve Greek material both from late antiquity and the early Arabic translations. His extant monumental commentary on the *Categories* presents an Arabic summation of the exegetical work by the late antique Alexandrian philosophers.

23 Al-Bīrūnī] d. after 1050AD

Arguably the greatest scientist of medieval Islam, his works draw on the vast array of scientific and philosophical works available to him in Arabic, both translations and original compositions. See the comprehensive entry on him in *Encyclopaedia Iranica* IV 274–287 (also available on line).

24 & 25 Ibn-al-Qiftī] d. 1248 & az-Zawzanī] fl. 1249AD

The extensive biographical dictionary of philosophers and physicians by the Egyptian/Syrian scholar and administrator in Aleppo Ibn-al-Qiftī (d. 1248) survives in abridgment by a certain az-Zawzanī, compiled in 1249. Ibn-al-Qiftī drew mainly on previous work by Ibn-an-Nadīm, supplemented by whatever other information he could find in the literature.

26 Ibn-Abī-Uṣaybi'a] d. 1270AD

Syrian physician and bibliographer, whose extensive *Essential Information on the Generations of Physicians*, completed in 1268, incorporates valuable information not only on physicians but also scholars of the secular sciences. He derived his information from the available translation literature, early Arabic biographies, personal examination of manuscripts of many of the works he catalogued, and his wide circle of acquaintances among physicians and scholars of his time.

III.

TITLES OF BOOKS

Diogenes Laertius includes within his *Life of Theophrastus* a catalogue of writings (5.42–50 = 1.68–291). The catalogue is not a single list but five lists plus addenda. The first of the five is the longest containing 109 titles arraigned in alphabetical order (5.42–46 = 1.68–176). The second list contains 66 titles also in alphabetical order (5.46–48 = 1.177–242). The third is even shorter, being 27 titles long. It marks a departure in that it is not arranged alphabetically (5.48–49 = 1.243–269). The fourth and the fifth are still shorter, 15 and 5 titles, respectively, but there is a return to alphabetical order (5.50 = 1.270–284, 285–289). The addenda are two titles (5.50 = 1.290–291). That gives a grand total of 224 titles. Since there are places where scholars differ concerning the ending of one title and the beginning of a new title (e.g., Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ αὐξήσεως α' 5.50 = 1.272, discussed below), the grand total as reported by other scholars may differ slightly. The number 224 is based on the division of titles printed in the text-translation volumes.

Four of the five lists in Diogenes' catalogue are arranged alphabetically, but the arrangement is not strict alphabetization, which takes account of entire words, beginning with the first letter and proceeding methodically to the last.¹ Rather, the focus is for the most part on the first letter of the significant word within the title. For an example I cite the second list and the five titles that make up the group marked by delta: Δειλινῶν α'β', Δαιρέσεις α'β', Περὶ τῶν διαφορῶν α', Περὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων α', Περὶ διαβολῆς α' (1.185–189). Clearly we do not have strict alphabetization. To be sure, Δειλινῶν α'β' coming first might suggest strict alphabetization, but Περὶ διαβολῆς should not be last. And Περὶ ἀδικημάτων might be deemed a foreign

¹ The earliest example of strict alphabetization is Harpocrations' *Lexicon of the Ten Attic Orators*. Harpocration belongs to the second century AD (see above "The Sources" no. 4 p. 20) and therefore predates Diogenes Laertius, who belongs to the early third century. Whether or not Diogenes was familiar with strict alphabetization, he seems to have taken over a much earlier catalogue (see the next paragraph) without attempting to reorder the titles. For that we may be grateful, for what Diogenes records most likely provides a snapshot into the workings of the library in Alexandria.

element that belongs among the alpha-titles. Most likely *Περὶ ἀδικημάτων* was placed among the delta-titles, because the person who made the list thought that the delta in *ἀδικημάτων* was more important than the initial alpha. A work on injustices cannot ignore justice, which may be thought to stand behind and govern the entire discussion.²

In the past Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean titles has often been attributed to Hermippus of Smyrna (2nd half of the 3rd century BC),³ who was active in Alexandria and is known to have been a follower of Callimachus (ὁ Καλλιμάχῃος, Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 5.52 213F and 15.52 696F). He wrote a work entitled *On Theophrastus* (Diogenes Laertius 2.55 = app. 1.61–64 = Hermippus, fr. 52 Wehrli) and is thought to have included a catalogue of Theophrastean titles within that work. That Hermippus did compose a catalogue of Theophrastean writings is not to be doubted (see the note appended to Theophrastus' *Metaphysics/On First Principles* 12b1); most likely it was incorporated into the work *On Theophrastus*. But it is doubtful that Hermippus *qua* follower of Callimachus would construct and publish a catalogue like that found in Diogenes' *Life of Theophrastus*: one which mixes alphabetical and non-alphabetical lists and admits duplicate titles not only in different lists but also in the same list.⁴ To be sure, the occurrence of duplicates might reflect separate purchases by a librarian, who was concerned to fill out a collection and therefore was prepared to make purchases that included one or more duplicates,⁵ but that

² For a second possible explanation, see *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) p. 98.

³ The attribution goes back to Usener (1858) pp. 22–24. For an authoritative reply to Usener, see now Bollansée (1999b) pp. 163–177, 233–243, who offers a well-grounded warning against “unfounded conjectures based on evidence that is no longer available” (p. 177).

⁴ An example of duplication is *On Slander*. The title occurs in three different lists (5.46 = 1.189, 5.49 = 1.252, 5.50 = 1.275). An example of duplication in the same list is *Ethical Characters*. It is found twice in the second list (5.47 & 48 = 1.201 & 241, 436 no. 4a).

⁵ Purchasing a duplicate might seem wasteful, but a librarian might deem that unimportant compared with the acquisition of other Theophrastean writings not present in the library's collection. True enough, but the idea that separate purchases by one library (that in Alexandria) explains duplication in Diogenes' catalogue is no more than a conjecture. See R. Blum, *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen* (Frankfurt am Main: Buchhändler-Vereinigung 1977) col. 317–319, S. White, “Opuscula and Opera in the Catalogue of Theophrastus' Works,” in *On the Opuscula of Theophrastus*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh and G. Wöhrle = *Philosophie der Antike* 14 (Stuttgart: Steiner 2002) p. 19 and my remarks in *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) p. 50 n. 7. I do not want to ban the idea of separate library purchases as altogether foolish, but I do want to acknowledge that in *Commentary* 8 (2005) and in *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) I was too ready to accept the idea of separate purchases and to attribute Diogenes' catalogue to Hermippus.

need not point to Alexandria and Hermippus, nor need it imply one particular library. Diogenes' catalogue may be a composite, whose origins are diverse.⁶

The catalogue as it has come down to us seems to reflect the work of Andronicus of Rhodes (2nd half of the 1st century BC), who divided the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus into treatises that brought together shorter works on related topics (Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus* 24 = 39.7–8). That created collective works some of which seem to have made their way into Diogenes' catalogue. A frequently cited example is *Περὶ ζώων α'–ζ'*, *On Living Creatures* in 7 books. It occurs in the first list, which is alphabetical. To be precise, it occurs under zeta and is preceded by seven titles all of which concern living creatures but only two of which contain the word ζῶων (5.43–44 = 1.108–115). Apparently the titles of the seven smaller works have been printed in front of the collective title, thereby creating the appearance of disorder: five titles without a zeta seem out of place. The appearance is real, but an explanation can be offered. At a date sometime between Andronicus and Diogenes, the collective title and its seven divisions were entered together in the first list of the catalogue under zeta. In a list organized alphabetically, that is improper and confusing, but in the present case it is intelligible.⁷

There is another title referring to animals that might be explained in a similar manner. I am thinking of *Περὶ τῶν αὐτομάτων ζώων α'*, *On the Creatures Produced Spontaneously*, 1 book (5.46 = 1.193 = 350 no. 5c). It is found in the second list, which is arranged alphabetically, but it is out of order.⁸ It occurs after *Ἐπιστολῶν α'β'γ'*, *Letters*, 3 books (5.46 = 1.192 = 727 no. 15) and before *Περὶ ἐκκρίσεως α'*, *On Secretion*, 1 book (5.46 = 1.194 = 328 no. 14). I.e., it occurs among titles whose significant word begins with

⁶ Cf. Bollensée (1999b) p. 170: the catalogue of Theophrastus' writings "looks like the work of an armchair scholar, who uncritically threw together lists he came across into a new list which Diogenes in turn copied into his work."

⁷ Related but also different is the case of six titles that occur together earlier in the first list, which is organized alphabetically (1.89–94 = 134 no. 3 and 137 no. 34–38). The first title refers to Democritus and introduces titles whose significant word begins with delta. The fifth title also has delta at the beginning of its significant word, but the other four titles do not. It seems clear that the six titles are grouped together because all concern Democritus. Different from the titles that concern animals and are listed together later in the first list (1.108–115) is the absence of a collective title referring to a work that brought together the six works concerning Democritus. See, e.g., Sollenberger (1984) pp. 237–239 and Sharples (1998) pp. 26–28.

⁸ P. Huby "Theophrastus in the Aristotelian Corpus" in *Aristotle on Nature and Living Things: Philosophical Studies Presented to David M. Balme*, ed. A. Gotthelf (Pittsburgh: Mathesis 1986) p. 318 and Sharples, *Commentary* 5 on Biology (1995) p. 43.

epsilon, In the case of *Περὶ τῶν αὐτομάτων ζῶων*, *αὐτομάτων* might be deemed the significant word, but *ζῶων* is the stronger candidate. And if that is correct, we might guess that the title was added to the existing list at a later date and without proper attention. It should have been entered six lines later after the last title whose significant word begins with epsilon and before the first title whose significant word begins with eta. That is not impossible, but I suspect that the mistake occurred earlier when the list was first constructed. The person composing the list got ahead of himself and entered *Περὶ τῶν αὐτομάτων ζῶων* before he had finished the titles beginning with epsilon. He chose the easy remedy, entered the omitted titles after *Περὶ τῶν αὐτομάτων ζῶων* and then turned to titles beginning with eta.

A different kind of problem is the inclusion of titles that may or may not refer to Theophrastean writings. Three candidates immediately come to mind: *Ἱστορικῶν γεωμετρικῶν α'–δ'*, *Ἀστρολογικῆς ἱστορίας α'–ς* and *Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ αὐξήσεως α'*, 4 Books of *Geometrical Researches*, 6 Books of *Astronomical Research* and 1 Book of *Arithmetical Researches on Increase* ($5.48 = 1.245 = 264$ no. 3, $5.50 = 1.271 = 137$ no. 43 and $5.50 = 1.272 = 264$ no. 2). The titles are similar to the titles of works attributed elsewhere to Eudemos, Theophrastus' contemporary within the Peripatos.⁹ Believing that the Peripatos under Aristotle was committed to historical research and finding in the fragments of Theophrastus no clear evidence that he wrote histories of geometry, astronomy and arithmetic, scholars today are inclined to see the three titles as misplaced. Properly understood, the titles refer to works by Eudemos, who is deemed the first person to write a true history of mathematics.¹⁰ That may well be correct, but Jørgen Mejer has recently argued strongly against this understanding of the Theophrastean titles.¹¹ The word *ἱστορία* and its cognate *ἱστορικά* are not references to history understood as a factual, chronological account of the development of three different branches of mathematics. Rather, they refer to research into a variety of problems within three different areas. Lacking expertise in ancient mathematics, I leave the issue to scholars working on science and mathematics as it was practiced and reported in the early Hellenistic period.

⁹ See J. Mejer, "Eudemos and the History of Science," in *Eudemos of Rhodes*, ed. I. Bodnár and W. Fortenbaugh = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 11 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2002) pp. 244–245, where the Eudemian and Theophrastean titles appear conveniently on opposite pages.

¹⁰ Cf. Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 8 p. 113, R. Sharples, "Eudemos" in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*³ (2003) p. 565 and Zhmud (2002) pp. 263–264 and (2006) pp. 2, 15–16, 147–152.

¹¹ Mejer. op. cit. pp. 243–261.

Already in antiquity and before the publication of Diogenes' *Lives of the Philosophers*, the attribution of works to Theophrastus was disputed. That is clear not only from Diogenes' catalogue which includes 'Υπομνημάτων Ἀριστοτελικῶν ἢ Θεοφραστίων α'–ζ', *Aristotelian or Theophrastean Memoranda*, 6 books (5.48 = 1.237, see below title no. 6) but also from Athenaeus, who twice speaks of a work Περὶ ἡδονῆς, *On Pleasure*, that was attributed both to Chamaelon and to Theophrastus (*The Sophists at Dinner* 6.105 273C = 550.5–6 = Chamaeleon, fr. 9.5–7 Martano and 8.39 347E = 553.2 = Chamaeleon, fr. 8.2–3). In addition, Diogenes lists the title *To Cassander On Kingship* without any indication that the attribution is disputed (5.47 = 1.207). But Athenaeus reports that many persons attribute the work to Sosibius (4.25 144E). For our purposes, deciding between Theophrastus and Sosibius is unimportant. What we need to keep in mind is that Diogenes' catalogue includes a disputed title without indicating that it is disputed. That might apply to Ἱστορικῶν γεωμετρικῶν α'–δ', Ἀστρολογικῆς ἱστορίας α'–ζ and Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ αὐξήσεως α', but I am inclined to think otherwise.¹²

A different problem is the occurrence of titles not found in Diogenes' catalogue. I begin with two, Περὶ ἡθῶν, *On Dispositions*, and Ἠθικά, *Ethics*, both of which might be expected in the case of Theophrastus, given his keen interest in ethics. *On Dispositions* is cited by Athenaeus (*The Sophists at Dinner* 15.15 673E = 437.3), by two Aristotelian commentators on the *Nicomachean Ethics*: the Anonymous (on 4.2 1121a7 = 516.2–3 and 5.3 1129b29–30 = 529A.6) and Michael of Ephesus (on 5.3 1129b29–30 = 529B.3), and also by a scholiast on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (4.2 = app. 516). The Athenaeus passage reports that Adrastus published five books *On Questions of History*

¹² The title Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ αὐξήσεως α' is sometimes emended to create two titles: Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν and Περὶ αὐξήσεως α'. That appeals to persons who think that Diogenes' catalogue includes three works of Eudemus, one of which is referred to by the first half of the divided title (e.g. Zhmud [2002] p. 264 n. 1). The first half may be compared with the Eudemian title Ἀριθμητικὴ ἱστορία, which occurs in Porphyry's *On Ptolemy's Harmonics* p. 115.4–5 Düring = fr. 142 Wehrli. The fact that the first half of the divided title lacks a book number is awkward, but not fatal, for several titles in Diogenes' catalogue lack book numbers (5.42 = 1.73, 5.48 = 1.241, 5.50 = 1.276, 5.50 1.289–291). The plural in Diogenes and the singular in Porphyry is more serious. To be sure, the difference might be seen as simple variation, but for persons who want to see the work of Eudemus as a history of arithmetic, the use of the singular is preferable, for it suggests a single, unified history. In contrast, the plural suggests research into various arithmetical problems. And if the title as it occurs in Diogenes is not split in two, then the prepositional phrase περὶ αὐξήσεως is a welcome addition. It completes the title by indicating that the various problems belong together in that they are all concerned with increase. I strongly recommend leaving the title alone. Good philology tends to be conservative.

and *Style in the On Dispositions of Theophrastus and a sixth on the (same matters) in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (437.2–5). Apparently the work contained considerable material of historical and stylistic interest, but it would be hasty to conclude that *On Dispositions* was significantly longer than Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (see *Commentary* 6.1 on Theophrastus' ethics [2011] pp. 131–133). The second title, *Ethics*, is cited by Plutarch (*Pericles* 38.2 = 463.5) and by three Aristotelian commentators on the *Nicomachean Ethics*: the Anonymous (on *NE* 5.3 1129b29–30 = 529A.6), Michael of Ephesus (on 5.3 1129bb29–30 = 529B.4) and by Aspasius (on 7.15 1154b7–15 = 555.7). Since Andronicus is said to have divided the writings of Theophrastus into treatises, it is easy to see in the title *Ethics* the work of Andronicus. That fits well with the idea that Diogenes' catalogue is largely taken from Hermippus, who predates Andronicus. But as all too often there is no certainty here.

Unlike the preceding two titles that are missing in Diogenes' catalogue but find a ready home among the ethical titles (436 no. 1 and 2) and hence are discussed in *Commentary* 6.1, there are five titles that do not appear in Diogenes' catalogue and that do not find a ready home within the categories that have been used in arranging our collection of sources. For that reason, they have been placed under "Miscellaneous Items." One such title occurs in Arabic: *Kitāb masā'il Tāwufraṣtus, The Problems by Theophrastus*. It is recorded by Ibn-an-Nadīm and Zawzanī (727 no. 5) and is listed after two Greek titles that are found in Diogenes catalogue and refer to problems (no. 3 and 4). The other four titles are in Greek or Latin: Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα, *Research Memoranda* (no. 7), liber Commentorum, *Book of Commentaries* (no. 9a) and Commentum, *Commentary* (no. 9b), which are simple variations referring to the same work, and Πέπλος, *Robe* (no. 10). All will be discussed in what follows according to their number, i.e., their position in the list that is 727. For completeness' sake, I call attention to three more titles which have their primary listing elsewhere, but which are mentioned among the miscellaneous titles, because they are related more or less closely to one or more of the miscellaneous titles. I am referring to Περὶ τῶν Προβλημάτων φυσικῶν α', *On the Problems concerning Nature*, 1 book (137 no. 26a), a variant in Arabic, *Kitāb fī l-masā'il at-ṭabī'ya* (no. 26b) and Περὶ εὐρήσεως, *On Invention* (666 no. 4). These titles, too, will be discussed according to their position in the list of miscellaneous titles.

Scholars regularly distinguish between the exoteric and esoteric works of Aristotle and Theophrastus. The former were intended for a wide audience and the latter for use within the Peripatos. In his work *On Ends*, Cicero takes note of the distinction when he speaks of "two kinds of books on the

highest good: one written in a popular style which they used to call exoteric and another more refined, which they left in the form of commentaries" (5.12 = 498.1–3). Among the exoteric works belong the dialogues of Aristotle and Theophrastus. A shared title may serve as an example: both Peripatetics wrote a work entitled Ἐρωτικὸς, (*Dialogue*) *concerning Love* (Diogenes Laertius and 5.22 and 5.43 = 436 no. 29). Also to be included among the exoteric works are essays and addresses. Again a shared title: both Aristotle and Theophrastus wrote a Προτρεπτικὸς, *Exhortation* (5.22 and 5.49, 50 = 436 no. 33). Among the esoteric works belong the treatises that have come down to us in the *corpus Aristotelicum* and cover a broad range of topics from logic to physics and natural science, metaphysics, ethics, politics, rhetoric and poetics. In the case of Theophrastus, the surviving treatises are fewer but nevertheless well represented by the botanical writings and the scientific *opuscula*. Also to be included among the esoteric works are collections, like Aristotle's collection of constitutions and Theophrastus' collection of laws. So too collections of problems and theses and works entitled *Memoranda*.¹³ Finally, we should recognize that certain writings could play a role both within and outside the school. Dialogues may have been written primarily for the larger public, but there was nothing to prevent their introduction into classroom discussion. The same can be said of an essay like *Exhortation*. And to take an example that has not been mentioned, a work like the *Characters*, a collection of thirty sketches of socially unacceptable behavior, is obviously humorous and will have played well outside the school, but it could also enliven a classroom discussion of superficial character traits that are manifested throughout a person's behavior.¹⁴

For further discussion of titles, see the fuller introduction to Chapter III "Titles of Books" in *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) pp. 121–130 and my article "Theophrastean Titles and Book Numbers" (1998) pp. 182–200.¹⁵

¹³ On problems and memoranda, see below on titles no. 3–7, and on theses see Commentary 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) pp. 83–87.

¹⁴ See, e.g., "Die Charaktere Theophrasts: Verhaltensregelmäßigkeiten und aristotelische Laster," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 118 (1975) pp. 62–82, reprinted in English as "The Characters of Theophrastus, Behavioral Regularities and Aristotelian Vices," in *Theophrastean Studies* (Stuttgart: Steiner 2003) pp. 131–149.

¹⁵ "Theophrastean Titles and Book Numbers: Some Reflections on Titles Relating to Rhetoric and Poetics" in *Fragmentsammlungen philosophischer Texte der Antike* = *Aporemata* 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1988) pp. 182–200; reprinted in *Theophrastean Studies* (Stuttgart: Steiner 2003) pp. 195–212.

no. 1 *Course of Lectures*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.42 = 1.82

Literature: Usener (1858) p. 15; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1534; Sollenberger (1984) pp. 232–233, 304; Fortenbaugh (2005) pp. 150–151

The title Ἀκροάσεως α'β', *Course of Lecture(s)*, 2 books is found in the first list of Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Theophrastean writings.¹⁶ That list is organized alphabetically, so that the title appears among those whose significant word begins with alpha. Among the works beginning with alpha it occurs toward the end of the list and after works that in a modern catalogue would come later. That is because the alphabetization of Diogenes' catalogue is not strict or complete, i.e., does not proceed to the second letter and so on.¹⁷

Within Diogenes' catalogue it seems quite certain that the noun ἀκρόασις has the meaning "lecture" or better "course of lectures," for given the following reference to two books or rolls, interpreting the singular (i.e., the genitive singular ἀκροάσεως) as a reference to one and only one lecture would be odd. In saying that, I do not want to deny that lectures can be long, but a lecturer like Theophrastus, who attracted large numbers of students,¹⁸ is likely to have divided up a given topic into a series or course of lectures that respects the attention span of most students. In addition, we should compare Diogenes' catalogue of Aristotelian writings, in which we find the title Πολιτικῆς ἀκροάσεως ὡς ἡ Θεοφράστου α'β'γ'δ'ε'ς'ζ'η', "A *Course of Lectures on Politics* like that of Theophrastus, 8 books" Here we have ἀκρόασις in the singular used of a course of lectures that is almost certainly our Aristotelian *Politics* in 8 books. How one should understand the phrase ὡς ἡ Θεοφράστου is problematic. We know that Theophrastus wrote at length on political matters, but a Theophrastean work in 8 books is nowhere mentioned in the sources.¹⁹

¹⁶ In the text-translation volumes, the title was translated *Lectures*. That is not entirely wrong, but as will be argued, *Course of Lectures* is better. In any future edition of the text-translation volume, the change to *Course of Lectures* should be made.

¹⁷ See the introduction to this chapter p. 67.

¹⁸ According to Diogenes Laertius, about 2,000 students came to Theophrastus' school (*Lives* 5.37 = 1.16).

¹⁹ Scholars have made various suggestions concerning a Theophrastean work on politics in 8 books. Here are two: Create a work in 8 books by combining Πολιτικῶν α'–η' with Πολιτικοῦ α'β' (5.45 = 1.143 = 589 no. 1 and 5.50 = 1.288 = 589 no. 2). Or assume that after the death of Aristotle Theophrastus played a role in editing the Aristotelian work in 8 books and this lead to Theophrastus' name being attached to the work. For the scholarly literature and some discussion, see Sollenberger pp. 277–279 and Mirhady pp. 84–85.

For our purposes, that is of little importance. Our interest is in ἀκρόασις used in the singular of a course of lectures; the Aristotelian title provides a clear example.

In the Aristotelian example given above, the word Πολιτικῆς makes clear that the course of lectures in 8 books focused on political matters. Our concern is a Theophrastean title that refers to a course of lectures in 2 books without a qualifying word or phrase. That is a difficulty, which Usener wanted to remove by identifying the work Ἀκροάσεως α'β' with Δειλινῶν α'β', *Afternoon (Lectures)*, 2 books (5.46 = 1.185 = 727 no. 2), which occurs later in the second list of Diogenes' catalogue. Usener proposed changing Ἀκροάσεως to Ἀκροάσεων (singular to plural) in the earlier title in order to create agreement with Δειλινῶν in the later title. Take the two together and we have a title that does not need to be supplemented: either Ἀκροάσεων δειλινῶν α'β', or with the words reversed Δειλινῶν ἀκροάσεων α'β', *Afternoon Lectures*, 2 books. That has some appeal, especially in regard to the later title. Fleshing out Δειλινῶν by adding ἀκροάσεων is an obvious possibility, but it is not the only possibility: one could supply, e.g., λόγων. Less attractive is altering Ἀκροάσεως to read Ἀκροάσεων in the earlier title. To be sure the change is minimal: a single letter (sigma is changed to nu), but there is no manuscript support for the change. Moreover, as the Aristotelian title makes clear, the singular is quite intelligible, and a qualifier other than Δειλινῶν might be imagined. The primary reason for accepting Usener's suggestion is the agreement in book number (both titles are followed by α'β'). To be sure, that is a consideration, but in my judgment it does not justify emending the text in a printed edition (as Usener [1858] does p. 4). The suggestion belongs in the critical apparatus.²⁰

According to Diogenes Laertius, Metrocles of Maroneia was at one time a student of Theophrastus, but later he became a student of Crates and set fire to the lectures of Theophrastus: τὰς Θεοφράστου ἀκροάσεις (*Lives* 6.94–95). Here we have the plural of ἀκρόασις, but it is not part of a title. Rather,

²⁰ If the two titles refer to the same work and if the original title was Ἀκροάσεων δειλινῶν α'β', or with the words reversed, then we might ask how the title came to be divided and included in two different lists. To offer a complete and convincing answer is beyond my imagination. Nevertheless, I suggest that the break up of the title will have occurred before the first list of Diogenes' catalogue was composed. For that list is alphabetical, and in my judgment δειλινῶν is the significant word in the original title. Or as a variation, we might think that the full title was originally placed in the second list, a copyist erred, so that the two words became separated and a second copyist entered Ἀκροάσεων in the first list toward the end of the alphas. But these musings are not to be taken further, especially when the starting point is an if-clause.

ἀκροάσεις might refer to a collection/selection of Theophrastus' lectures that Metrocles had somehow acquired (copied?) while a student of Theophrastus. Alternatively, ἀκροάσεις might refer to Metrocles' notes on the lectures of his former teacher,²¹ or perhaps a combination of lectures and notes. Be that as it may, having become a student of Crates, Metrocles was no longer interested in the lectures and burnt them. I see nothing here that supports Usener's emendation of the Theophrastean title. In the text of Diogenes (6.95), ἀκροάσεις is used descriptively and without any commitment to a single topic or unified course of lectures.

no. 2 Afternoon (Discussions), 2 books] Diogenes Laertius 5.46 = 1.185

Literature: Usener (1858) p. 15; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1534; Gigon (1958) p. 171 n. 45; Sollenberger (1984) p. 232, 304; Fortenbaugh (2005) pp. 150–152

In the second list of Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings, we read Δειλινῶν α'β', *Afternoon (Discussions)*, 2 books. The second list is arranged alphabetically; Δειλινῶν α'β' comes first among the books whose significant word begins with delta.²² In the preceding comment on title no. 1, I have already discussed Usener's attempt to identify titles no. 1 and 2 and concluded that the attempt (it involves emending title no. 1) be confined to the critical apparatus. That leaves open how one fleshes out title no. 2. Since Δειλινῶν can be masculine, feminine or neuter, there are several possibilities: e.g., λόγων or διαλόγων (masc.), ἀκροάσεων or ἀσκήσεων (fem.), προβλημάτων or ἐρωτημάτων (neut.) In the text-translation volume, we translated "*Afternoon (Discussions)*" which suggests supplying λόγων or διαλόγων.²³

The title Δειλινῶν, "Afternoon" calls to mind the fact that Aristotle is said to have taught rhetoric in the afternoon. Philodemus in his work *On Rhetoric* tells us that Aristotle trained his students in rhetoric in the afternoon, saying that it is shameful to keep quiet and to allow Isocrates to speak: τῆς δεῖλης ἐγύμναζεν ἐπιφωνήσας, αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν, Ἴσοκράτην δ' ἐὰν λέγειν (vol. 2 p. 50 Sudhaus = fr. 31 Düring p. 299). Similarly we read in Quintilian that when Isocrates was already old, Aristotle began to teach the art of rhetoric in his afternoon lectures: *postmeridianis scholis Aristoteles praecipere artem*

²¹ Notes on the lectures of Theophrastus is Sollenberger's suggestion. (p. 233).

²² Among the titles whose significant word begins with delta, there occurs Περὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων α', *On Injustices*, 1 book (5.46 = 1.188 = 66 no. 10). The title appears to be misplaced. For an explanation, see above the introduction to this chapter pp. 67–68.

²³ Sollenberger p. 125 translates with "Lectures". In the Loeb edition vol. 1 p. 495, Hicks prefers "Essays."

oratoriam coepit (*Oratorical Education* 3.1.14 = fr. 32d Düring p. 312). Aulus Gellius says that Aristotle taught rhetoric in the evening, *vesperi*, and referred to it as afternoon discourse or lecture: δειλινὸν περίπατον *appellabat* (*Attic Nights* 20.5.5 = fr. 76f Düring),²⁴ and Syrianus reports that during the afternoon cycle of students, Aristotle arranged for them to study rhetorical problems: Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν ταῖς δειλιναῖς περιόδοις τῶν ἐταίρων ῥητορικὰ προβλήματα μελετᾶν αὐτοὺς παρεσκεύαζε (*Scholia on Hermogenes* vol. 4 p. 297 Walz = vol. 2 p. 59 Rabe = fr. 33 Düring). Given these reports concerning Aristotle, it is not unreasonable to conjecture that the Theophrastean title refers to rhetorical materials that played a role in afternoon instruction within the Peripatos. Indeed, we might even take a cue from Aulus Gellius and understand περιπάτων with Δειλινῶν in title no. 2. That said, we must keep in mind that the rivalry with Isocrates is limited to Aristotle and that no text states explicitly that Theophrastus followed Aristotle and taught rhetoric during the afternoon. Indeed, it is possible that Theophrastus rearranged the teaching schedule when he took over the headship and that he made several changes during his long period as head of the School.

- no. 3 *Collection of Problems*, 5 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.45 = 1.147
- a–b *Collection of Problems*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.48 = 1.226
- no. 4 *Political, Natural, Erotic, Ethical Problems*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.47 = 1.224
- no. 5 *The Problems by Theophrastus*] Ibn-an-Nadīm, *The Index* 7.1, chap. on Ibn-al-Ḥammār (p. 265.10 Flügel), Zawzanī, *Selections from Qiftī's History of the Philosophers*, chap. on Ibn-al-Ḥammār (p. 164.18 Lippert)
- see 137 no. 26a (*On the Problems concerning Nature*, 1 book)
- 137 *On the Problems concerning Nature*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius 5.48 =
- no. 26 1.227 and 5.49 = 1.266
- a–b *On the Problems concerning Nature*] Ibn-Abī-Uṣaybi'a, *Essential Information on the Generations of Physicians* 4, chap. on Theophrastus (vol. 1 p. 69.26 Müller = app. 3A); Bīrūnī, *Collected Information on Precious Stones*, chap. on lead (p. 258.15 Krenkow) = 183

Literature: Regenbogen (1940) col. 1406; Flashar (1962) pp. 321–322; Fortenbaugh (1984) pp. 134–135, (2011) pp. 218–222, (2012b) pp. 12–13; Daiber (1985) pp. 108–110; Sollenberger (1984) p. 280, 329–331; Sharples (1998) pp. 25–26

²⁴ On περίπατος, see LSJ s.v. περίπατος II.2, where the noun is explained as “discourse during a walk, discussion, argument,” after which the use of the noun in *Attic Nights* 20.5.5 is explained as Aristotle's name for “his morning and evening lectures.”

We have here several titles, all of which make reference to *Problems*. Titles 727 no. 3, 4 and 5, have their primary listing among the Miscellaneous titles. The next two titles, 137 no. 26a and b, have their primary listing among the titles referring to works on Physics.

In the text-translation volumes, entry 727 no. 3 is bipartite: first comes Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α'–ε', *Collection of Problems*, 5 books; second comes Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α', *Collection of Problems*, 1 book. The title is the same, but the number of books is not. Assuming that the book numbers are correct and therefore that the works referred to are not of the same length, the two titles, albeit identical, do not refer to one and same work. The work in 1 book might be part of the work in 5 books or it might be an entirely different work. For that reason, 727 no. 3 should be divided into 3a and 3b. See Chapter IX “Corrigenda and Addenda” p. 296.

727 no. 3a occurs in the first list of Diogenes' catalogue (1.147) and no. 3b in the second list (1.226), both of which are arranged alphabetically. Hence, both titles occur among those whose significant word begins with pi. The genitive singular συναγωγῆς depends upon the book numbers: “five books of a *Collection of Problems*” (3a) and “1 book of a *Collection of Problems*” (3b).²⁵

727 no. 4 runs Προβλήματα πολιτικά, φυσικά, ἐρωτικά, ἠθικά α', *Political, Natural, Erotic, Ethical Problems*, 1 book. It occurs in the second list among the titles brought together under pi. Title no. 4 differs from titles 3a and b in that it specifies four areas with which the problems are concerned: politics,²⁶ nature or physics, eros and ethics. Two of the areas are closely related: namely politics and ethics. Indeed, ethics can be viewed as part of politics.²⁷ Eros is closely related to ethics²⁸ and less so to politics, but in our collection of Theophrastean texts, see 625 and 626 on eros resulting in war and determining its outcome. Nature or physics is in some respects more remote: it opens the door to the physical world, which is marked

²⁵ The genitive construction is common in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean titles (cf. 727 no. 1–2, 6, 15). Concerning the genitive construction in the pseudo-Aristotelian title Φυσικὰ προβλήματα κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς. See below note 40.

²⁶ In a single codex Q, ποιητικά occurs instead of πολιτικά, and that brings to mind Chapter 25 of Aristotle's *Poetics*, which is introduced by the phrase περὶ προβλημάτων καὶ λύσεων (1460b6). Clearly a Peripatetic work on *Problems* might well include topics that belong to poetics, but in the case before us (a reading in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings) codex Q is dependent on one of the three primary codices, P, which reads πολιτικά. See *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 220–221.

²⁷ For ethics as a part of politics, see, e.g., Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.2 1094a26–1.4 1095a17.

²⁸ See, e.g., 557, where eros is said to be an excess of a certain irrational desire, and 558, where we read that Theophrastus described eros as an emotion of a soul at leisure.

by motion and change. But natural occurrences such as storms and floods and crises generally can be the occasion for making political and ethical decisions.²⁹ And φύσις in the sense of character, both innate and acquired, can have important political, ethical and erotic consequences: see 503 for a person's nature being his fate and 504–505 regarding the misfortune of Callisthenes.³⁰ How much attention each of these four areas received in the work in question is not reported. The work is said to have been only one book long, but a single book or roll is compatible with an economical and balanced treatment that brought together a series of interesting problems in each area.³¹ That said, it should be acknowledged that the title itself only lists four areas, it does not state explicitly that the areas were separated neatly and treated one after the other. The work could have been of jumble, but I prefer to think of a work that was well organized by area.

137 no. 26a refers to two identical titles, to which the same number of books are attributed: Περὶ τῶν προβλημάτων φυσικῶν α', *On the Problems concerning Nature*, 1 book.³² Almost certainly the references are to one and the same work. Since the titles occur in the second list of Diogenes' catalogue, which is arranged alphabetically, and in the third list, which is not alphabetical, it is likely that duplication reflects combining two lists of different origin.³³ The use of the preposition Περὶ at the head of the title as well as the use the definite article τῶν before προβλημάτων is not found in 727 no. 3 and 4. The difference is probably insignificant. The article τῶν does not refer to some special, well-known list of natural or physical problems; rather it is forward-looking, referring to the problems that will be discussed in the work. And Περὶ does not indicate a special theoretical discussion about how to handle natural/physical problems. That is not to rule out some sort of

²⁹ The *καιρός*, the critical moment, is a special concern of Theophrastus. Three titles, 589 no. 4a–b, 5 and 6, make explicit mention of crises, *καιροί*.

³⁰ Cf. the pseudo-Aristotelian *Physical Problems*. Within this work, whose title makes explicit reference to nature, we find four books, whose headings announce a tie to particular ethical and political concerns. See below.

³¹ On variation in the length of *monobibla*, see *Commentary* 8 (2005) on rhetoric and poetics pp. 50–52.

³² In the text-translation volumes, the fact that 137 no. 26a refers to two identical titles is not made clear in the backward references under 727 (vol. 2 pp. 584–585). It is clear earlier in the list of physical titles 137 (vol. 1 pp. 286–287).

³³ At one time I might have argued that the duplication reflects separate purchases by the Library in Alexandria, but that would be no more than a guess. Moreover, the idea that Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings goes back to Hermippus, who composed a catalogue in which five separate lists (including the second and third) were thrown together without editing is hard to accept. See the introduction to this chapter, above p. 68.

introduction, but the bulk of the work will have been a series of particular problems together with possible resolutions.³⁴

The reference to προβλήματα φυσικά in title 137 no. 26a invites comparison with the pseudo-Aristotelian work Φυσικά προβλήματα, *Natural/Physical Problems*. That work is found in our *corpus Aristotelicum* and most likely contains portions that are Aristotelian in origin. But it did not reach its final form under Aristotle or even Theophrastus.³⁵ It seems best to regard the work as a Peripatetic compilation that was added to by various members of the School throughout the Hellenistic period. As we have it today, the work is of considerable length (col. 859a1–967b27 Bekker)³⁶ and divides into 38 books, some of which are quite short.³⁷ For the most part, the individual problems are put forward in the form of questions beginning with διὰ τί, “on account of what” or “for what reason,”³⁸ after which one or more answers are proposed, typically introduced by ἢ ὅτι or ἢ ὁρ πότερον ὅτι.

³⁴ Sollenberger p. 331 calls attention to 137 no. 26a = 1.227 and to the omission of Περί τῶν προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α' (727 no. 3b = 1.226).

³⁵ The pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* contains considerable material drawn from Theophrastus' botanical writings and from his scientific *opuscula*, on which see below. Regarding the so-called *Supplementa Problematorum*, see the recent edition with introduction, translation and commentary by S. Kapetanaki and R. Sharples: *Pseudo-Aristoteles (Pseudo-Alexander), Supplementa Problematorum*, Berlin: de Gruyter 2006. On possible connections between the *Supplementa Problematorum* and certain lost Theophrastean works, see Sharples, “Evidence for Theophrastus *On Hair, On Secretion, On Wine and Olive Oil?*” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classics Studies* 47 (2004) pp. 141–151.

³⁶ As Mayhew states (op. cit. p. xiii), the *Problems* is the third longest work in the *corpus Aristotelicum*.

³⁷ E.g., Book 36, which is the shortest, runs for half a Bekker column (965b1–17) and it achieves that length by repeating earlier material (36.2 = 2.17). Book 17 runs just over one column (915b37–916a39), and Book 6 is only slightly longer (885b14–886a29). By convention we speak of “books,” but for the average reader such usage can only seem odd and misleading. Moreover, the label “book” is no guarantee of unity. Among the three books mentioned above, Book 36 is focused on the face; Book 6 is largely concerned with positions of the body (section 6 is an exception); Book 17 contains three unrelated problems, the third of which is introduced by πῶς and not the unusual διὰ τί (see the next note). One can imagine a compiler coming upon a scrap on which the three problems were written and mindlessly inserting them without considering whether the three problems were sufficiently related to be treated as a unit. Other explanations can be imagined.

³⁸ In Mayhew's edition there are 903 chapters, of which 98 percent begin with διὰ τί (see p. xiii). Caveat: While the phrase διὰ τί may suggest Aristotle's efficient cause, it can be used widely to cover all four Aristotelian causes. See, e.g., *Physics* 2.3 194b19, where Aristotle uses the phrase in introducing his four kinds of cause. For a clear example of inclusive usage in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*, see 4.15. The chapter begins with the question “Why, διὰ τί,

The occurrence of *Φυσικά* in the pseudo-Aristotelian title is of some interest, for if the title is understood to apply to the entire work, then we have a title, in which *φυσικά* is used inclusively, so that it covers not only physical problems narrowly construed but also ethical and political material. I am thinking of four books, whose headings mention matters of ethical and political concern: Book 27 on fear and courage (947b11), Book 28 on temperance and licentiousness, continence and incontinence (949a23), Book 29 on justice and injustice (950a20), and Book 30 on intelligence and wisdom (953a9). That said, it should be pointed out that the focus of the pseudo-Aristotelian work is overwhelmingly physiological and that Books 27, 28 and 30 are largely concerned with the physiological basis of virtue and vice. Perhaps then the occurrence of *φυσικά* in title 727 no. 4 announces a physiological discussion of ethical character that is not out of place: it supplements a collection of political, erotic and ethical problems whose orientation is not physiological. That strikes me as possible but also highly speculative. Indeed, it should be underlined that Book 29 of the pseudo-Aristotelian work ignores the physiological underpinnings of just and unjust individuals. Rather its focus is legal justice and as such has much to say about lawgivers, legislation and courts of law.³⁹ I prefer, therefore, not to press comparison with the title of the pseudo-Aristotelian work. It is problematic and must be used with considerable caution in discussing the Theophrastean title.⁴⁰

is sexual activity most pleasant,” after which two possibilities are advanced: “Is it so for living creatures out of necessity, ἐξ ἀνάγκης, or for the sake of something, ἐνεκά τινος?” (878b1–2).

³⁹ It might be argued that for a Peripatetic philosopher both ethics and politics take their start from φύσις, i.e., the nature of human beings, and for that reason ethical and political problems that focus on the physiological basis of virtue and vice, i.e., Books 27, 28 and 30 are not out of place within a work entitled *Φυσικά προβλήματα*. We might imagine that these three books were incorporated into the *Φυσικά προβλήματα* at an early date and that given their ethical and political headings, the three books encouraged the inclusion of Book 29 despite its disinterest in physiology. Be that as it may, Book 29 is an intruder in the *Φυσικά προβλήματα*. My guess is that it was added to the collection after the title *Physical Problems* had been assigned, but whether after or before, once in the collection it remained. No one thought it important either to remove the Book or to emend the title of the collection. But enough speculation!

⁴⁰ According to Gerardo Marengi, *Aristotele: Problemi di Medicina* (Milan 1965, rev. 1999) p. 6, 21–22, 30, the codices, which transmit the pseudo-Aristotelian work, divide into four families. In three of the families, α, β and δ, the title of the work runs as follows: Ἀριστοτέλους φυσικά προβλήματα κατ’ εἶδος συναγωγῆς. After that come two words, Ὅσα ἰατρικά, which are separated from the title by a period and which are the heading to Book 1 of the work. Robert Mayhew has provided me with a photo of the oldest and best manuscript Parisinus Graecus 2036, 10th century, which belongs to family α. The table of contents on folio 1^r has on

Before leaving the pseudo-Aristotelian *Physical Problems* it should be emphasized that the work is of especial interest to scholars working on Theophrastus, for it draws on more than a few of Theophrastus' writings including the so-called scientific *opuscula*.⁴¹ There has been some discussion of which way the borrowing went, but today the majority view is that

one line Ἀριστοτέλους φυσικά προβλήματα and on a second line κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς, roughly centered and followed by two vertical dots (like an English colon) After that on a separate line comes α' (space) ὅσα ἰατρικά, i.e., the heading to the first book. On folio 2^r, all three lines are run together. If I understand correctly, we should be governed by the table of contents: the prepositional phrase κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς is to be taken closely with Φυσικά προβλήματα and to be translated "according to the form of a collection" or in ordinary English "in the form of a collection," (on εἶδος see LSJ s.v. II.). The phrase is a description of the work as whole. I prefer to see it as an add-on and not an integral part of the title, but that matters little.

Hett, the editor of the Loeb edition (1936 p. 2), understands the title differently. He prints κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς in a font that is not only noticeably smaller than that of Φυσικά προβλήματα but also the same size as the book number, Α (α') and the heading to Book 1 Ὅσα ἰατρικά. That suggests taking κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς with the book number. We might translate: "Book 1 of a collection arranged according to content." But that is not how Hett translates. He passes over συναγωγῆς and translates "According to their contents." I would prefer to translate εἶδος with the singular "content," but that is unimportant. What seems to me wrong is suppressing συναγωγῆς. If Hett's division of the title into two parts is accepted and if the genitive συναγωγῆς is dependent upon the book number, then we should translate as above: "Book 1 of a collection." Possible, but contrived. Hanging a genitive off a book number is familiar from Diogenes' catalogues of writings. But there the number is the total number of books into which a work divides and not one book of several. Moreover, the construction and hence the meaning would be clearer, were τῆς placed at the beginning: i.e., (τῆς) κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς Α.

According to Marengi, a shorter title is presented by the remaining family of codices, γ. It runs: Ἀριστοτέλους προβλημάτων τμήμα α'. "Ὅσα ἰατρικά. Here the genitive προβλημάτων gives the title and is dependent upon τμήμα α'. We might translate "Of Aristotle's *Problems* section 1 (i.e., Book 1), 'Those (problems) which concern medicine.'" Here the title has lost the qualifier "*Physical*," and the phrase κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς has dropped out.

Another possibility is suggested by two Theophrastean titles: Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α'-ε' and Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α', "*Collection of Problems*, 5 books" and "1 book," respectively (Diogenes Laertius 5.45, 48 = 727 no. 3a, b FHS&G). Here we have the genitive συναγωγῆς dependent on the total number of books (5 and 1). That suggests emending the longer manuscript title (that found in the three families α' β' δ') by changing Φυσικά προβλήματα to the genitive plural and adding λη' after συναγωγῆς. That would produce Φυσικῶν προβλημάτων κατ' εἶδος συναγωγῆς λη'. We might then translate, "*Collection of Physical Problems* arranged according to topic, 38 books." The phrase that follows, Ὅσα ἰατρικά, "Those which concern medicine" would be independent of what precedes and be the heading of Book 1.

Such speculation is fun but it is also idle. Much as the work itself was added to and modified over time so that it is no longer possible to say what problems constituted the original core, so too it is futile to try to pin down an original/correct title that one or more Peripatetics assigned to the work sometime during the Hellenistic period.

⁴¹ Citing Hermann Diels, *Hermes* 40 (1905) p. 315, Regenbogen col. 1406 lists *On Sweat, On Fatigue, On Winds, On Fire, On Dizziness, On Paralysis, On Melancholy, Plant Explanations, Research on Plants*.

the author(s) of the *Physical Problems* is (are) dependent on Theophrastus and not *vice versa*. That does not render unimportant the borrowings found in the *Physical Problems*, for the manuscript tradition of the Theophrastean *opuscula* is all too often corrupt, so that comparison with the indirect tradition can be helpful in emending or simply understanding what the Theophrastean text is saying. Since several of the *opuscula*, *On Sweat*, *On Dizziness* and *On Fatigue*, have been edited recently together with translation and commentary, and another *On Winds* is in progress, I refer the interested reader to these editions for fuller discussion.⁴²

Among Theophrastus' contemporaries within the Peripatos, Clearchus of Soli wrote a work entitled Ἐρωτικά. The neuter plural is vague: it might be translated *Erotic Matters*. There are, however, two Clearchan fragments that deal with eros and exhibit the διὰ τί formula (Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 12.79 553E = fr. 25.2 Wehrli and 15.9 669F = fr. 24.1). That encourages fleshing out the title Ἐρωτικά with the noun προβλήματα and seeing in the Clearchan work a discussion of problems concerning eros similar to what Theophrastus offered in his work Προβλήματα πολιτικά, φυσικά, ἐρωτικά, ἡθικά. We should, however, keep in mind that the Clearchan work was at least two books long.⁴³ That suggests a much fuller treatment of eros than was to be found in the Theophrastean work. In particular, it makes room for discussion of issues in which the διὰ τί formula would not be helpful and therefore was avoided.

One other Peripatetic may be mentioned. He is Aristo of Ceus, who is thought to have succeeded Lyco as head of the School (c. 225 BC).⁴⁴ Three times Aristo is referred to by Athenaeus as the author of a work entitled Ἐρωτικά ὅμοια, which was at least two books long (*The Sophists at Dinner* 10.14 419C = fr. 11.3–4; 13.15 563F = fr. 13a.8–9; 15.16 674B = fr. 10.2–3). Given the length of the Clearchan work (it too ran at least two books) and the fact

⁴² Regarding *On Sweat*, *On Dizziness* and *On Fatigue*, see W. Fortenbaugh, R. Sharples and M. Sollenberger, *Theophrastus of Eresus, On Sweat, On Dizziness and On Fatigue*, (Leiden: Brill 2003) pp. 12–15, 178 and 256. An edition of *On Winds* by Robert Mayhew will be published by Brill.

⁴³ In Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 6.16 255B = fr. 21 and 13.16 564A = fr. 22.3, the phrase ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἐρωτικῶν implies that the work was at least two books long. It leaves open the possibility of a third book or more.

⁴⁴ In antiquity Aristo of Ceus was confused with the Stoic Aristo of Chios. To make the point, I refer to Diogenes of Laertius' *Life* of the Stoic. There we find Diogenes including a catalogue of writings, which he introduces as the books of the Chian. But then at the end of the catalogue, he adds that Panaetius and Sosicrates attribute all the writings except the *Epistles* to the Cean (7.163 = Aristo of Ceus, fr. 8 Stork et al.).

that the Clearchan work included problems (διὰ τί), it is tempting to flesh out Aristo's title with προβλήματα: *Similar Problems Concerning Eros*. That is certainly possible, but I am inclined to understand the title as a reference to cases: i.e., *Similar Cases Concerning Eros*.⁴⁵ Either way, I am reminded of a Theophrastean text that does not refer to a work by title but does tell us that Theophrastus was interested in similar problems. The text is found in the Anonymous commentator, *On Aristotle's Posterior Analytics* 2.15 98a24 (CAG vol. 13.3 p. 590.4–10 Wallies) = 136. At the beginning of the text, the commentator tells us that Aristotle teaches how to recognize problems that are the same, for if we can explain one of the problems, then we can explain the others in a similar way. After that the commentator turns to Theophrastus and says the following: "Theophrastus, too, busied himself about the collection of problems which are similar. But he is enquiring in those (works) about which of the problems are similar to one another; Aristotle, on the other hand, is here teaching about how we may decide problems which are the same as one another." If I understand the Anonymous correctly, he is saying that Theophrastus limited himself to identifying problems that are similar; unlike Aristotle, he did not go on to discuss the explanation of similar problems. That may be true in some context, but Theophrastus will have understood that identifying similar problems is important, for solving one problem may point way to solving the another.⁴⁶

Two titles in Arabic remain for comment. One is 137 no. 26b, *Kitāb fī l-masā'il aṭ-ṭabī'īya*, *On the Problems concerning Nature*, and the other is 727 no. 5, *Kitāb masā'il Tāwufrastus*, *The Problems by Theophrastus*.⁴⁷ According to Dimitri Gutas, the two titles refer to the same Theophrastean work: Περί

⁴⁵ Fortenbaugh (2012) p. 13.

⁴⁶ We need to keep in mind that under one description a given problem can appear to be quite different from another problem, so that the two problems demand different explanations, but under further examination the two can turn out to be closely related and to admit similar explanations. The pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* is instructive. If we ask why trembling occurs in older people whose bodies are cold and in drunkards who consume wine which is hot, we may think that the cases are so different that the explanations cannot be the same or similar. But that is not true. We need to remember that nothing prevents opposites from having the same effect, but not in the same way: οὐθὲν κωλύει γίνεσθαι ταῦτ' ὑπὸ ἐναντίων, μὴ ὡσαύτως δὲ ποιούντων (3.26 874b36–37), and that not every cause is the proximate cause. Hot wine quenches the natural heat of the body and in that way effects cooling, so that in both drunkards and old men the proximate cause is the same: namely cooling (3.26 875a13–27).

⁴⁷ I am reporting the title as given in the text-translation volumes. Strictly speaking the reference to Theophrastus as author is not part of the title, i.e., the Theophrastean title. In any second edition of the text-translation volumes, the phrase "by Theophrastus" should either be printed in normal script, not italics, or it should be omitted as unnecessary in its context.

τῶν Προβλημάτων φυσικῶν, *On the Problems concerning Nature* (137 no. 26a), which in the Arabic literature is mentioned in different contexts. Of the bibliographers, Ibn-Abī-Uṣaybi'a (writing in 1268) mentions the work at the end of the section on Theophrastus, as an addition to a list of Theophrastus's works, which he copied from Ibn-an-Nadīm's *Index* (137 no. 26b = apparatus to line 10 of 3A; see facing page 49 note 2). It is mentioned by Ibn-an-Nadīm himself in his *Index* (*Fihrist*, completed in 987) in the section on the scientist and philosopher Ibn-al-Ḥammār, the translator of the work (727 no. 5). It is also mentioned by Zawzanī (writing in 1249) in his section on Ibn-al-Ḥammār, who copied Ibn-an-Nadīm (727 no. 5). Apart from the bibliographers, the Theophrastean work is mentioned by title only by al-Bīrūnī (d. after 1050) in his work on precious stones, along with a brief fragment from it (183).⁴⁸ According to a list of writings by Abū-l-Farağ Ibn-aṭ-Ṭayyib, the Nestorian theologian, physician, and philosopher (d. 1043), in an Istanbul manuscript (Nuruosmaniye 3610, f. 1^r, of unspecified date), Abū-l-Farağ wrote a commentary on Theophrastus' work.⁴⁹

The title appears divergent in these sources: Ibn-Abī-Uṣaybi'a and Bīrūnī citing it as *On Problems concerning Nature* and Ibn-an-Nadīm, followed by Zawzanī, as *Problems*, while Daiber does not cite the title of Abū-l-Farağ's commentary. There is, however, hardly any doubt that it concerns one and the same book. Neither the translation nor the commentary seems to have survived, though the entire tradition of Greek problem literature in Arabic has not been adequately studied. The Arabic and Hebrew translations of the *Problems concerning Nature* in the Aristotelian corpus have been published by L.S. Filius, *The Problemata Physica Attributed to Aristotle* (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus 11), Leiden: Brill 1999 (to be read in conjunction with the review by Manfred Ullmann in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 153 [2003] pp. 470–473). In his introduction (pp. xiii–xvi), Filius reports that in addition to the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* that he published, there are other texts of translated problems preserved in Arabic, in Syriac, and in Hebrew. The edition, translation, and study of all this material may unearth some texts by Theophrastus; at the very minimum, it will enhance our understanding of the compilation and transmission of this genre of Greek works.

⁴⁸ Fragment 183 concerns the relative weights of lead and gold or silver. In Sharples, *Commentary* 3 on physics (1998) pp. 129–130, the name of al-Bīrūnī is inadvertently misspelled as "al-Bīrūrī".

⁴⁹ Daiber (1985) 114 note 71.

- no. 6 *Aristotelian or Theophrastean Memoranda*, 6 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.48 = 1. 237; Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 4.74 173E (BT vol. 1 p. 390.11–12 Kaibel) = 587.1 (“Aristotle or Theophrastus in the *Memoranda*”) and 14.69 654D (BT vol. 3 p. 448.6–9 Kaibel) = 373.1 (“Aristotle or Theophrastus in the *Memoranda*”)

Literature] Rose (1854) p. 53, (1863) pp. 561–563; Usener (1858) p. 12; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1540; Moraux (1951) p. 70; Sollenberger (1984) pp. 339–340, 392; Sharples (1984) p. 188, (1995) p. 104; Engels (1993) p. 30; Bollansée (1999b) p. 171; Fortenbaugh (2011) p. 127, 209

In Diogenes Laertius’ catalogue of Theophrastean writings, we read: ‘Υπομνημάτων Ἀριστοτηλικῶν ἢ Θεοφραστίων α'–ς', *Aristotelian or Theophrastean Memoranda*, 6 books. The entry is found in the second list of the catalogue, which is arranged alphabetically. The words Ἀριστοτηλικῶν ἢ Θεοφραστίων tell us that the author of the work is in doubt: he might be Aristotle or Theophrastus.

In Athenaeus’ *The Sophists at Dinner*, the writing is referred to twice. On the first occasion, Ulpian is speaking.⁵⁰ In what precedes, he is focused on the persons who play different roles in the preparation and serving of food: cooks, table-makers, marketers, table-men, eaters and artisans (4.70–72 170D–172F). After that he turns his attention to the people of Delos and Delphi. Concerning the former, he tells us that they provide cooks and table-makers to all who come to Delos to participate in sacrifice. Apollodorus of Athens (2nd century BC) is cited as the source of the report (4.73 172F = FGrH 244 F 151). Concerning the Delphians, we are told that they are called spiced-gravy makers, because they serve up the meat of sacrifice with spiced sauces. For the report, the tragic poet Achaëus of Eretria (5th century) is cited (173C–D = TrGF 20 fr. 12–13). And when the Delphians go to Delos to sacrifice, the Delians are said to provide them with salt, vinegar, olive oil and bedding. The historian Semos of Delos (3rd century) is cited (4.74 173E = FGrH 396 F 7). Next we hear of the Magnesians who live along the Meander River and are consecrated to Apollo being colonists from Delphi.⁵¹ They are said to provide

⁵⁰ Ulpian, who is prominent in *The Sophists at Dinner*, is sometimes identified with the famous jurist Domitius Ulpianus, but the identification is problematic. For toward the end of work Ulpian is said to have died happily or opportunely, εὐτυχῶς (15.33 686C), which is not true of the historical jurist. Having been appointed praetorian prefect by Severus Alexander, the jurist died a violent death at the hands of his troops in 228 AD.

⁵¹ Two cities in Asia Minor were called Magnesia and both were inland. One was more northerly being located in Lydia on the northern slope of Mount Sipylus and near the River

the same services to travelers: in particular, shelter, salt, olive oil, vinegar, a lamp, beds, bedding and tables. The *Memoranda* of Aristotle or Theophrastus is cited as the source of this report (4.74 173E–F = 587).

On the second occasion, Ulpian is again speaking, this time discoursing at length on the food placed before the diners and doing so in order to impress them with his erudition (14.62 649E).⁵² After discussing a variety of fruits, Ulpian turns to meat and fowl, saying that he will draw on his wide reading. Citing Menander and others, he begins with a lexical comment on *περιστερίον*, the diminutive of the Greek word for pigeon (14.69 654A). Next Ulpian turns to pheasants, and citing the twelfth book of King Ptolemy's *Memoranda*, he tells us that the king never tasted pheasants, but had he done so, he would have added another book to his *Memoranda*, which was twenty four books in length (14.69 654B–D = *FGrH* 234 F 2a).⁵³ After that Ulpian cites the *Memoranda* written by Aristotle or Theophrastus. The author, we are told, spoke of the superior size of cock-pheasants over hens, stating that "the males do not exceed (the females in size) proportionately (to what is the case with other birds), but much more" (654D = 373).⁵⁴

On both occasions, Athenaeus writes Ἀριστοτέλης ἢ Θεόφραστος ἐν τοῖς Ὑπομνήμασι, "Aristotle or Theophrastus in the *Memoranda* (says)." In Diogenes' catalogue, we find Ὑπομνημάτων Ἀριστοτηλικῶν ἢ Θεοφραστίων α', Aristotelian or Theophrastean *Memoranda*. The wording is similar, but there are differences. In Diogenes the names of Aristotle and Theophrastus come first; in Athenaeus they come second. In Diogenes the reference to Aristotle and Theophrastus becomes, as it were, part of the title through the use of adjectival forms. In Athenaeus the two Peripatetics are referred to by proper

Hermus. It is here that the Romans defeated Antiochus in winter 190–89 BC. The other was more southerly being located in Caria south of the Meander River on a tributary called Lethaeus. It is of the people of this city that Ulpian speaks.

⁵² After stating his intention to discuss all the foods set before the diners (14.62 649E), Ulpian first discusses a food that is not being served but which he knows from Alexandria (649E–650B). That is not a lapse on the part of Athenaeus. Rather it is a way of portraying Ulpian as a man who will add material freely with a view to impressing his audience.

⁵³ The king is Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (182–116 BC) also known as Physcon, "Potbelly."

⁵⁴ Sharples (1995) p. 104 refers to the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* in which we read that males are generally, ὡς ἐπίπαν, larger than females (10.8 891b21–24) and to the *History of Animals* where we are told that among land animals that are not oviparous, males for the most part, τὰ πλείστα, are larger, except for the mule. But among those that are oviparous, females are larger (4.11 538a22–28). Since pheasants are oviparous we might think that the pheasant is exceptional among animals that lay eggs much as the mule is said to be exceptional among those that do not lay eggs, but Sharples is careful to point out that the passage says nothing explicitly about birds. He adds that the passage may represent an attempt to extend the discussion.

nouns in the genitive case, so that their names are not readily understood as part of the title. There is, I think, no difficulty here. In Diogenes' catalogue, we have a list compiled by a librarian or book seller, who wanted to indicate doubt concerning which of the two Peripatetics wrote the *Memoranda* and he has done so by adding to the title two names in adjectival form separated by "or." Athenaeus accomplishes the same by use of proper nouns in the genitive case separated by "or." Sollenberger sees the matter differently: the use of the adjectives in Diogenes' title suggests that the work entitled *Memoranda* was not necessarily written by Aristotle or Theophrastus. Rather it was a compilation that brought together the lecture notes of unnamed students. That cannot be disproved and it might be applied to the title as found in Athenaeus. Nevertheless, I prefer the first suggestion and note that the *Memoranda* is not the only work, of which the attribution to Theophrastus was disputed. Athenaeus provides an example, when he writes, "Theophrastus in the (treatise) *To Cassander on Kingship*" and then adds "if the treatise is genuine, for many say it is by Sosibius, for whom Callimachus the poet composed an epinician poem in elegiac verse" (4.25 144E = 603.1–3).⁵⁵ Of greater relevance may be a title included by Diogenes in his catalogue of writings by Strato: Ὑπομνήματα, ἃ διστάζεται, *Memoranda*, which are disputed, i.e., whose author is in doubt (5.60 = fr. 1.56 & 87 no. 2 Sharples). If we think of a work entitled *Memoranda* as a collection of relatively brief entries, often for teaching, then we can understand how the authorship of such a collection might be challenged. In the case of Aristotle and Theophrastus, that seems especially true, for they worked on many of the same areas and often in close agreement. But in a work that was six books long, one might expect enough clues to determine who was in fact the author.

The title *To Cassander on Kingship* is of interest for a different reason: the title divides into two parts of which the first part Πρὸς Κάσανδρον names the addressee, and the second part περὶ βασιλείας gives the subject. That invites comparison with the title *Memoranda*, for when the title is first mentioned by Athenaeus, it is followed by περὶ Μαγνήτων (4.74 173E = 587.1), and the comparison might tempt one to understand the prepositional phrase as part of the title. That is not foolish, for the title *Memoranda* leaves open what the content might be,⁵⁶ and the prepositional phrase might be thought to tell us

⁵⁵ On the treatise *To Cassander on Kingship* (589 no. 12), see Regenbogen col. 1516–1517, and on text 603, see Mirhady pp. 120–121.

⁵⁶ A work entitled *Memoranda* might have dialectic as its subject (in Diogenes' catalogue of Aristotelian writings we find Ὑπομνήματα ἐπιχειρηματικά γ', *Memoranda concerning Dialectical Arguments* 3 books [5.23]), or it might be concerned with political theory (in Diogenes'

that the work was focused on the Magnesians. Nevertheless, the temptation is to be resisted, for Diogenes' catalogue not only lists the title as *Memoranda* without a qualifying prepositional phrase but also tells us that the work ran for six books. It stretches credulity to say that a work concerning the people of Magnesia ran for that number of books. Moreover, in the text of Athenaeus the phrase *περὶ Μαγνήτων* is followed (after an intervening *λέγων*, "saying") by the words *τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ Μαιάνδρου ποταμοῦ*, "those (Magnesians living) along the Maeander River" (587.2). The additional words are helpful, for there were two cities named Magnesia in western Asia Minor.⁵⁷ But if the additional words are construed as part of the title, then the title is unusually long. It is, I think, better to stay with Diogenes and to attribute the words *περὶ Μαγνήτων* ... *τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ Μαιάνδρου ποταμοῦ* to Athenaeus or his source.⁵⁸

The texts of Athenaeus inform us that the *Memoranda* written by Aristotle or Theophrastus included discussions of two quite different topics. The earlier speaks of the Magnesians as consecrated to Apollo, and the later speaks of the disproportionately large size of cock-pheasants. Broadly stated, religion and cult practices are the subject matter of the earlier text, while zoology or ornithology is the subject matter of the later. Since the *Memoranda* ran for six books, we can imagine that it covered many different fields, but two texts are not sufficient to tell us how wide a net it cast. In particular, we do not know whether it made room for mythology and local legend in the way that Peripatetic works entitled *Peplos* and *On Discoveries* did.⁵⁹ See below on titles no. 10 and 11.

no. 7 *Research Memoranda*] Scholium on Apollonius, *Argonautica* 4.834 (p. 296.2 Wendel = 196A.3–4)

Literature] Rose (1854) p. 53, (1863) pp. 561–563; Usener (1858) p. 11; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1540; Flashar (1972) p. 40; Sollenberger (1984) p. 340, 360–361, 392; Sharples (1984) p. 188, (1998) pp. 163–164, 166–167; Engels (1993) p. 30

catalogue of Theophrastean titles we find Πῶς ἄριστ' ἂν πόλεις οἰκοῖντο ὑπομνήματα α', *Memoranda* [concerning] *How Cities may Best be Governed* [5.49 = 1.263 = 589 no. 8]), or it might consider meteorology (196A, see below on title no. 7). The possibilities are many.

⁵⁷ See above n. 51.

⁵⁸ It might be suggested that the phrase *περὶ Μαγνήτων* was originally the heading of a section within the *Memoranda*, while the words that follow were either part of that heading or a later addition. The suggestion is not impossible, but it has little to recommend it and merits no further comment.

⁵⁹ I am speaking only of the *Memoranda* attributed to Aristotle or Theophrastus, i.e., 727 no. 6. As Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights* pref. 6–8 makes clear a work entitled *Memoranda* (*Memo-riales* in Gellius) can be grouped together with works entitled *Peplos* and (*On*) *Discoveries*.

The title Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα, *Research Memoranda* is not found in Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. Rather, it occurs in a scholion on the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius and only there (but see the penultimate paragraph of this comment). The context in the *Argonautica* is Hera's request to Thetis to protect the Argonauts as they travel by ship along the coast of Italy. And that involves getting Hephaestus to stop stoking the fire of his forge. Commenting on this text, the scholiast speaks of fire being vented upwards in the sea and noise being heard at a distance. Metrodorus' work *On Research*⁶⁰ and Theophrastus' *Research Memoranda* are cited as sources. The comment involves problems that are both geological or in Peripatetic terminology, meteorological (fire venting up in the sea suggests an underwater volcano, but none has been found)⁶¹ and lexical (the manuscripts report incorrectly the distance at which the noise is heard). For fuller discussion, see above, Chapter II "The Sources" no. 20 pp. 61–63.

Taken by itself, the qualifying adjective Ἱστορικά might be construed narrowly as a reference to the history of city-states and nations, their political and military actions. The Theophrastean title Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα might then be translated *Historical Memoranda*. That has its appeal, especially when one recognizes a sub-division of ὑπομνήματα-literature that developed in the course of the Hellenistic period: one that embraced history in general and biography and autobiography in particular. I have no quarrel with recognizing the development of such a genre. See Engels' 1993 article "Die Ὑπομνήματα-Schriften und die Anfänge der politischen Biographie and Autobiographie in der griechischen Literatur." I am, however, concerned that we may be thinking anachronistically. Theophrastus stands at the beginning of the Hellenistic period and his work cannot be assumed to anticipate a later development. Moreover and more importantly, the sole text referring to Theophrastus' Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα concerns a warming of the sea and loud noise probably caused by volcanic activity. Perhaps the work was largely confined to meteorological matters, but it is likely to have included much more.⁶² Given such uncertainty, I think it sensible to translate the Theophrastean title as *Research Memoranda*. The noun ἱστορία is

⁶⁰ On Metrodorus, see above p. 62 n. 189.

⁶¹ Sharples (1998) p. 163 observes that in antiquity earthquakes and volcanic activity were regularly treated as part of meteorology. Aristotle discusses them in Book 2 of his *Meteorology*, and according to J. Mansfeld, "A Theophrastean Excursus on God and Nature and its Aftermath in Hellenistic Thought," *Phronesis* 37 (1992) p. 317, Theophrastus may have done the same.

⁶² Cf. 373 and 587, from which we learn that the disputed work entitled *Memoranda* (title no. 6) contained reports concerning quite diverse matters: ornithology (cock-pheasants and

inclusive: it can be used of both historical and scientific research and was used by Aristotle and Theophrastus in regard to their zoological and botanical investigations. See below on Title no. 8.⁶³

Unfortunately the sole text that mentions *Research Memoranda* does not tell us whether the work was short or long. The disputed work entitled *Memoranda* (no. 6 above) is reported to have been six books long (1.237), which is compatible with a large variety of topics, but by itself that cannot determine the length of *Research Memoranda*. Also relevant but problematic is Πῶς ἄριστ' ἂν πόλεις οἰκοῖντο ὑπομνήματα α', *Memoranda (concerning) How Cities may be Best Governed*, 1 book. That is the title of a Theophrastean work as printed in the text-translation volumes (Diogenes Laertius 5.49 = 1.263 = 589 no. 8). It occurs in the third list of Diogenes' catalogue, and suggests a work of limited length and focus: perhaps a collection of notes and brief essays, some theoretical and others factual, dealing with political arrangement and administration. But again, this title, even in combination with ὑπομνήματα, cannot tell us whether *Research Memoranda* was short, long or in between.⁶⁴

hens) and religion (persons consecrated to Apollo and their practices). We might compare Aristoxenus' σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα, miscellaneous memoranda (FHG vol. 2 290.6), cited by Engels (1993) p. 29. See Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 2 pp. 85–87 on fr. 128–139.

⁶³ The scholium names both Theophrastus and Metrodorus as sources for the report concerning fire being vented upward in the sea. It might be argued that since the reference to Metrodorus includes mention of Book 1 of his work Περὶ ἱστορίας and since Metrodorus is included in Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (cf. TLG), we should translate Metrodorus' work as *On History*. And for consistency, we should translate the Theophrastean title in a similar manner, i.e., as *Historical Memoranda*. The argument is not foolish, but I am not convinced. Much may depend upon the English words "history" and "historical," which in modern usage most often refer to political and military history and to matters dealt with chronologically. But there are also substantive concerns. Metrodorus was no *Fachidiot* who limited himself to historical issues. According to Strabo he was initially a philosopher, then led a political life and showed himself a rhetorician in his writings, using a new style which impressed many (*Geography* 13.1.55 = *FGrH* 184 F 2). The scholium tells us that he reported volcanic activity in the Strait of Messina. The report may have been a footnote to a discussion focused on history narrowly construed. But it is also possible that the meteorological phenomenon was cited for its own sake and that Metrodorus' work included much that is not normally described as historical. The same can be said regarding the Theophrastean work. It may have been and in my judgment is likely to have been an inclusive collection of research memoranda (σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα). Ἱστορικά is not qualified in the way that ἱστορία is in the Theophrastean title Περὶ φυτῶν ἱστορία, but translating with "research" is preferable for it corresponds to Theophrastean usage and in any case makes room for zoological, botanical and meteorological phenomena, which are known to have interested Theophrastus.

⁶⁴ Aristotle's *Memoranda concerning Dialectical Arguments* is reported to have been three books in length (see above, p. 88 n. 56). But even if book numbers can be explained in terms of scrolls, we cannot assume that all books were of roughly the same length. On variation

In the preceding paragraph, I described the title *Memoranda* (*concerning*) *How Cities may be Best Governed* as problematic, for the manuscripts offer variant readings, which leave one wondering whether the title in question refers to one work, Πῶς ἄριστ' ἂν πόλεις οἰκοῖντο ὑπομνήματα α', or to two works, Πῶς ἄριστ' ἂν πόλεις οἰκοῖντο α' and Ὑπομνήματα α'. As Sollenberger reports, the single title is found in five of the seven primary manuscripts and in five secondary manuscripts.⁶⁵ That is significant support for a single title, and if my memory is correct, that is why we chose to print a single title. Nevertheless, the manuscripts that support two titles cannot be ignored,⁶⁶ and there are scholars of considerable weight who have opted for two titles.⁶⁷ Rather than trying to decide between the two possibilities, I prefer to leave the issue open and to call attention to Köpke, who proposed supplying ἱστορικά before ὑπομνήματα, thereby introducing into Diogenes' catalogue an explicit mention of the title that occurs only in the scholium on Apollonius, i.e., the title Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα. That seems to me overly bold. It depends not only on printing two titles despite strong manuscript support for one but also and more importantly on supplying an adjective that totally lacks manuscript support.

Sollenberger thinks it probable that the title Πῶς ἄριστ' ἂν πόλεις οἰκοῖντο ὑπομνήματα α' (5.49 = 1.263) refers to the same work as Περὶ ἀρίστης πολιτείας, *On the Best Constitution* (5.45 = 1.146).⁶⁸ The idea is by no means foolish and can apply to the title divided in two. I.e., it can apply just as well to Πῶς ἄριστ' ἂν πόλεις οἰκοῖντο α'. The fact that the two titles occur in different lists within Diogenes' catalogue (the third list and the first list, respectively) is compatible with referring to the same work,⁶⁹ but compatibility is not proof.

in length, see my article "Theophrastean Titles and Book Numbers" (1998) pp. 184–190, repr. pp. 197–203 and Sharples *Commentary* 5 on biology (1995) pp. 128–130, who discusses the number of the books that make up *Research on Plants*. In Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings, *Research on Plants* is listed as 10 books in length (5.46 = 1.172), but in modern editions it is 9 books in length. If our Book 9 was originally divided in two (9.1–7 and 9.8–20), that would make ten books, the tenth being twice as long as the ninth: 16 columns as against 8 in Wimmer's edition. And when combination occurred, the ninth book will have tripled its size.

⁶⁵ On the primary and secondary manuscripts, see Sollenberger pp. 41–65 and on the title in question, see pp. 360–361.

⁶⁶ See the critical apparatus to 1.263 vol. 1 p. 39 FHS&G.

⁶⁷ See, e.g., Usener (1858) p. 11, Rose (1863) p. 561, Long in the OCT (1964) vol. 1 p. 224 and Dorandi in the forthcoming Budé edition.

⁶⁸ Cf. Usener (1858) p. 16 and Regenbogen col. 1516.

⁶⁹ Duplicate copies of the same work occur in more than one list: e.g. *On Slander*, which occurs in three lists without variation in title (see the introduction to this chapter). And

My preference is to recognize that the two titles indicate a close relationship in content but not duplicate copies of the same work. Perhaps *On the Best Constitution* was a tightly organized treatise, to which a collection of notes or memoranda contributed. But that is no more than a guess.

no. 8 *On Research*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.47 = 1.203

Literature] Rose (1863) p. 138; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1526; Walbank (1960) repr. p. 394; Brunt (1980) repr. pp. 216–217; Sollenberger (1984) p. 315; Rebenich (1997) p. 267; Mejer (2002) p. 248; Zhmud (2002) p. 291 n. 122; Marincola (2003) p. 298; Fortenbaugh (2005b) pp. 319–320

The title *Περὶ ἱστορίας α'*, *On Research*, 1 book is found in the second list of Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. The list is arranged alphabetically, so that the title comes after *Περὶ θορύβου α'*, *On Clamor*, 1 book and before *Περὶ κρίσεως συλλογισμῶν α'*, *On the Deciding of Syllogisms*, 1 book. The former seems to announce a rhetorical work (666 no. 14),⁷⁰ while the latter points to logic (68 no. 10). That tells us nothing about the content of *Περὶ ἱστορίας*, for in an alphabetical list, similarity in content is not a determining factor.⁷¹ That said, it should be noted that not a few scholars (e.g., Rose, Regenbogen and more recently Rebenich) have identified *Περὶ ἱστορίας* as a rhetorical work that concerned itself with the writing of history. The idea is understandable. History conceived of as a written account of the political and military actions of city-states and nations became a recognizable genre in the fifth and fourth centuries. Given Theophrastus' encyclopedic interests and his keen interest in rhetoric and prose style, it is easy to imagine a work entitled *Περὶ ἱστορίας*, in which rhetorical issues received special attention. In support, one might cite Cicero's *Orator* 39 = 697, where the historians Herodotus and Theophrastus are named. Cicero characterizes favorably their style of writing and then adds, "Historical writing was first moved by these men, as Theophrastus says, so that it dared to speak more fully and

occurring in the same list is also compatible with referring to the same work. The *Characters* appears twice in the second list (5.47 = 1.201 and 5.48 = 1.241).

⁷⁰ The title *On Clamor* is discussed in *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) pp. 111–113. While the emphasis may have been rhetorical, it is likely to have exhibited an interest in political and ethical issues.

⁷¹ An apparent exception is found in the first list, which is alphabetical but includes among the zeta-titles five that do not have a word beginning with zeta anywhere in their title (5.43–44 = 1.111–115). Most likely their position in the list reflects content: they deal with ζῷα, animals. See the introduction to this chapter, p. 69.

ornately than formerly (was the case).⁷² There is no reason to doubt what Cicero reports, but he mentions no Theophrastean work, so that other candidates cannot be excluded. One that comes to mind and fits well with what Cicero says (speaking “more fully and ornately”) is the work *Περὶ λέξεως*, *On Style* (Diogenes, *Lives* 5.47 = 1.210 = 666 no. 17a), on which see *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005b) pp. 319–320.

Instead of viewing *Περὶ ἱστορίας* as a rhetorical work, it might be better characterized as historical. Aristotle seems not to have written a work entitled *On History*; his pupil Theophrastus may have filled the hole. Perhaps Theophrastus took his start from Aristotle's *Poetics* in which history is marked off from tragedy (9.2–9 1451b1–32). In addition, it has been widely held that Theophrastus taught the historian Duris (c. 340–260 BC), who wrote “tragic history,”⁷³ in which entertainment and excitement took precedence over fact. Given the student teacher-relationship with Aristotle and the putative teacher-student relationship with Duris, it is hard not to think of the Theophrastean work as focused on the writing of history, i.e., as a monograph that treated the genre from a uniquely historical perspective. Fair enough, but the alleged relationship with Duris rests largely on an emended text, i.e., Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 4.1 128A = 18 no. 9,⁷⁴ where the manuscript prior to emendation mentions Duris along with his brother Lynceus in a clause whose sole purpose is chronological. Here is the text without emendation.

Ἱππόλοχος ὁ Μακεδών, ἑταῖρε Τιμόκρατες, τοῖς χρόνοις μὲν γέγονε κατὰ Λυγκέα καὶ Δοῦριν τοὺς Σαμίους, Θεοφράστου δὲ τοῦ Ἐρεσίου μαθητής.

“Hippolochus the Macedonian, friend Timocrates (to whom Athenaeus is speaking), belonged to the time of Lynceus and Duris the Samians, and a pupil of Theophrastus the Eresian.”

⁷² The passage is cited by Rose, Regenbogen and Sollenberger.

⁷³ For the phrase “tragic history,” see, e.g., C.O. Brink, “Tragic History and Aristotle's School,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 186 (1960) pp. 14–19. While Walbank (1960, repr. 2011 pp. 393–394) accepts (“reasonably assumed”) that Theophrastus' *Περὶ ἱστορίας* was concerned with historiography and that Duris was a pupil of Theophrastus, he thinks it unlikely that Theophrastus approved of the style of Duris (pp. 393–394). Walbank is also clear that tragic history is not attributable to the Peripatos; indeed, its main features “go back well beyond the Hellenistic period” (p. 390, 410–411). Cf. Marincola pp. 297–302, who supports and strengthens the view of Walbank.

⁷⁴ See Regenbogen (1940) col. 1526, J. Barron, “The Tyranny of Duris of Samos,” *Classical Review* NS 12 (1962) p. 191 and R. Kebric, “A note on Duris in Athens,” *Classical Philology* 69 (1974) pp. 286–287.

Unemended the text provides a date for Hippolochus, who is then said to have been a student of Theophrastus. Following a suggestion by Korais, Schweighaeuser changed the Greek text—he changed *μαθητής* (nominative singular) to *μαθητάς* (accusative plural)—so that Duris and Lynceus became students of Theophrastus.⁷⁵ That Lynceus was a student of Theophrastus is indeed reported elsewhere (Athenaeus 8.18 337D = 18 no. 10; cf. 3.58 100E = 18 no. 10 and 4.5 130D = 76), but no text says that Duris was one as well.⁷⁶ In any new edition of *The Sophists as Dinner*, the manuscript reading of 128A ought to be printed. That will give scholars pause before identifying Theophrastus closely with the practice of “tragic history.”

There is still another way of viewing the Theophrastean title *Περὶ ἱστορίας*: namely as a monograph on research. It is well known that the Peripatos under both Aristotle and Theophrastus was given to research in a wide variety of fields. Indeed, on occasion the two seem to have divided among themselves important areas of research: e.g., Aristotle investigated animal life and collected the constitutions of 158 cities, while Theophrastus investigated plants and collected the laws of city-states (Cicero, *On Ends* 5.10–11 = 385, 590).⁷⁷ These investigations became the subject of books, some of which were entitled or referred to as *Ἱστορία* (singular) or *Ἱστορίαι* (plural).⁷⁸ In the case of Theophrastus, there is *Περὶ φυτῶν ἱστορία* (singular), *Research on Plants*, which is the title found in the manuscripts. For the same work, Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings gives the title with only minor variation: *Περὶ φυτικῶν ἱστοριῶν* (plural) α'–ι', *Researches on Plant Matters*, 10 books (1.172 = 384 no. 1c).⁷⁹ And in his work on *Plant Explanations*, Theophrastus himself uses *Ἱστορίαι* (plural) without qualifying words

⁷⁵ See I. Schweighaeuser, *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas* vol. 2 (Strassburg: Societas Bipontina 1802) pp. 386–387. The emendation is repeated in the Teubner text of Kaibel, the Loeb of Gulick and the replacement Loeb (2006) of Olson.

⁷⁶ A. Dalby, “The Curriculum Vitae of Duris of Samos,” *Classical Quarterly* N.S. 41 (1991) pp. 539–541. Given Lynceus' connection with Theophrastus, it is hard not to think that Duris, his brother, also enjoyed some sort of relationship with Theophrastus. But to assume that it was a student-teacher relationship strikes me as bold.

⁷⁷ I am not suggesting that the division was so strict that neither trespassed on the other's territory. In the case of Theophrastus, he had much to say about animals in shorter monographs that seem to have been collected and made into a larger work in seven books: *Περὶ ζώων α–ζ'* (5.45 = 1.115).

⁷⁸ “Some of which” but not all of which: e.g., Theophrastus' collection of laws was known as *Νόμων κατὰ στοιχείον κδ'*, *Laws in Alphabetical Order*, 24 books (1.136 = 589 no. 17a).

⁷⁹ The number of books attributable to *Researches on Plant Matters* is problematic. See Sharples, *Commentary* 5 on biology (1995) pp. 128–130.

in order to refer to *Research on Plants* (e.g. in *Plant Explanations* 1.5.3, we read ἐν ταῖς Ἰστορίαις).⁸⁰

How, then, should we understand the title Περὶ ἱστορίας α' in the second list of Diogenes' catalogue? Is it an abbreviation of Περὶ φυτῶν ἱστορίας α'? Or has φυτῶν fallen out through scribal error, leaving ἱστορίας, which originally depended on the book number α': one book of *Research on Plants*. The title might refer to a single book of the multi-book work *Research on Plants*. Or has some other word referring to quite a different field fallen out: e.g., νόμων or ἀριθμῶν? That is possible, but in my judgment, it is better to accept the title as it occurs, Περὶ ἱστορίας, and to ask what it might mean. One possibility is that ἱστορία, research, is the subject of the work and the singular is used to indicate that the discussion is general in nature. Or the work begins with a general discussion of research and then applies general principles to particular areas of research.

A quick look at the opening of *Research on Plants* will be helpful. Theophrastus begins by stating that the distinctive characteristics of plants and their nature in general are to be understood according to their parts, qualities, modes of generation and life cycles. He notes briefly that plants, unlike animals, have neither ethical dispositions nor activities, after which he says that in the case of plants differences in generation, qualities and life cycles are relatively easy to observe, but differences in parts are more complex. Indeed, it has not been sufficiently determined what counts as a part (1.1.1). In what follows, Theophrastus compares the parts of plants with those of animals (1.1.2), but he is careful to add that we should not expect a complete correspondence between plants and animals (1.1.3) and that we should not try to make comparisons where it is impossible to do so, for our investigation might be sidetracked and no longer suitable to the subject under consideration, i.e., plants (1.1.4). That is good Peripatetic doctrine: method is subject-specific.⁸¹ But it does not rule out discussing methods of investigation or research in general. Theophrastus has already taken note of similarity in moving from plants to animals and vice versa (1.1.3) and he will soon mention analogy (1.1.5). It is easy to imagine, Theophrastus beginning a

⁸⁰ For additional passages, see 384 no. 1f. Amigues vol. 1 (1988) pp. xvi–iii provides a succinct discussion of the variations in title. Citing P. Louis, “Le mot ἱστορία chez Aristote,” *Revue Philosophique* 129 (1955) pp. 39–44, Amigues points out that ἱστορία in the Theophrastean title covers both the scientific research, i.e., methodical investigation of Theophrastus in the area of botany and the end product of the research, i.e., the exposition of the information obtained through careful investigation.

⁸¹ See, e.g., Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.3 1094b11–27.

discussion of research by explaining *inter alia* the importance of similarity and analogy and their importance for research in general, after which he goes on to discuss similarity and analogy with special reference to plants and animals.

Equally suggestive is Theophrastus' subsequent discussion of the three ways in which plants differ in regard to their parts: 1) some kinds of plants possess a particular part, while in other kinds it is absent; 2) plants may possess parts that are dissimilar or unequal; 3) the parts may be differently arranged (1.1.6). That this tripartite list can be applied to animals is, I think, obvious. Indeed, Theophrastus makes the point when he picks out the most important parts of plants, calls them members and adds "just as in the case of animals" (1.1.9). Once again it is easy to imagine Theophrastus stating generally the importance to research of the three kinds of difference and then applying them to plants and animals.⁸²

Theophrastus' tripartite list of differences in parts is of interest not only because it can be applied to both plants and animals but also because it can take us beyond plants and animals to human beings. And not just to physical differences like those of color and size⁸³ but also to differences in behavior. I am thinking of emotions that are marked off from each other in various ways including inequality and absence. In regard to inequality (the more and less, 1.1.6), I cite lust, which Theophrastus defines as an excess of an unreasoning appetite, whose coming is swift and parting slow (Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.20.64, vol. 4 p. 468.4–7 Hense = 557). In other words, (moderate) appetite becomes lust when appetite intensifies. In regard to absence, I cite hate, which Aristotle dissociates from pain (Rhetoric 2.4 1382a13). I know of no Theophrastean passage in which hate is discussed in relation to pain, but given Theophrastus' sketch of faultfinding (*Characters* 17), it is tempting to say that he will have marked off faultfinding from anger and rage in that it is not accompanied by painful sensations. Or perhaps more likely, Theophrastus will have recognized that faultfinding is often painful but not always. Absence does occur (more frequently

⁸² Later Theophrastus says that in plants there is no part present in all kinds in the way that mouth and stomach are common to all animals (1.1.10). The statement does not mean that presence and absence have no application to animals. What Theophrastus says applies only to mouth and stomach.

⁸³ Pygmies are different from other human beings in size. To be sure, there are persons who are small on account being confined and malnourished (ps.-Aristotle, *Problems* 10.12 892a7–22), but there are others whose small size marks them off as different in kind. See *History of Animals* 8.12 597a7–8, where Aristotle speaks of pygmies and states that there really is a γένος that is small.

than one realizes), which is not true of pain in anger and rage. For further discussion I refer to my article “Theophrastus on Emotion” (1985) pp. 212–220, repr. (2003) pp. 74–84 and to *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) p. 248, 665–666.

I turn now to four titles, three of which have been mentioned in the introduction to this chapter.⁸⁴ They are *Τῶν περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἱστορίας α'–ζ'*, *Research on the Divine*, 6 books (1.243 = 251 no. 1 [Not mentioned in the introduction]), *Ἀστρολογικῆς ἱστορίας α'–ζ'*, *Astronomical Research*, 6 books (1.271 = 137 no. 43), *Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ αὐξήσεως α'*, *Arithmetical Researches on Increase* (1.272 = 264 no. 2) and *Ἱστορικῶν γεωμετρικῶν α'–δ'*, *Geometrical Researches*, 4 books (1.245 = 264 no. 3). None of these titles refers to botany, zoology or the emotional behavior of human beings. The first refers to things divine; in the text-translation volumes it has been placed in the section whose heading is “Theology.” The second refers to astronomy and has been included among the titles dealing with “Physics.” The third and fourth titles refer to arithmetic and geometry, and find their place in the section on “Mathematics.”⁸⁵ The last three are alike in that their inclusion in a list of Theophrastean titles is problematic. Their attribution to Eudemus finds notable support in the scholarly literature.⁸⁶ But that matters little in regard to our understanding of the title *Περὶ ἱστορίας*. Important is the fact that all four titles take us beyond plants, animals and emotional behavior, and in doing so they make clear that *ἱστορία* casts a wide net. A work entitled *Περὶ ἱστορίας* might focus on careful, methodical research in many different areas, picking out what is common to all or most areas of research and what is peculiar to one or more areas.⁸⁷ But that is speculation; there is no QED, so that *Περὶ ἱστορίας* is best listed among the “Titles Referring to Collections and Miscellaneous Items” (727).

⁸⁴ Above p. 70.

⁸⁵ The last three can be considered together as exact sciences. See Zhmud (2006) pp. 11–12.

⁸⁶ See above, the introduction to this chapter, p. 70 at n. 10.

⁸⁷ While I am inclined to think that a general treatment of *ἱστορία* will have focused on or at least given pride of place to research on mathematics and natural science, I want to resist excluding political and military history which might be of interest in that research in these areas tends to focus not only on single events but also facts about the past which rule out autopsy and force the researcher to depend heavily on reports which may be no better than hearsay. In addition, I would like to think that a work *Περὶ ἱστορίας* distinguished clearly between methodical research aiming at truth and collections that carried the title *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*, *On Discoveries*, but it might do so by implication without ever focusing on the stuff of mythology and legend that was included in works on discoveries. See below on title no. 11.

- no. 9a Book of *Commentaries*] *Light of the Soul* B, ch. 7, On the Blessed Virgin, A (ed. a. 1477² Farinator) = 180; *ibid.* Q = 284; ch. 10, On the Saints, P = 190; ch. 37, On Confession, Ta = 291; *ibid.* Ya = 292; ch. 38, On Contemplation, B = 290; ch. 39, On Guilt, G = 168; ch. 49, On the Love of God, Na = 178; ch. 56, On Sleeping, P = 342; ch. 61, On Rejoicing, D = 286; ch. 63, On Wisdom, E = 448; ch. 72, On Sleep, F = 343 ("in book 3"); *ibid.* R = 344 ("in the book of *Commentaries* about the part [of the soul] concerned with sensation," cf. 267)
- b *Commentary*] *Light of the Soul* B, ch. 8, On Angels, D (ed. a. 1477² Farinator) = 288 and cf. Anthology, ch. 9, On the Soul = 268 ("in his *Commentary* [on the book] On the Soul")

Literature: Schmitt (1971b) p. 266; Sharples (1984) pp. 187–189, (1995) pp. 23–24, (1998) pp. 110–112; Huby (1999) p. 5, 16–17

We have here two titles: a) *liber Commentorum/Commentatorum*, book of *Commentaries* and *Commentum, Commentary*, which differ in number, plural versus singular. The difference in number might be explained as follows: there was one Theophrastean work, which was divided into recognizable segments, and that gave rise to the plural *Commentaries*. But no text states that clearly, and more importantly, *Light of the Soul* is quite unreliable in regard to ancient sources: i.e., who said what and in what work.⁸⁸ That may not have concerned the Christian preachers, who viewed the work as a treasure trove, from which they could draw illustrative material for use in their sermons.⁸⁹ But for our purposes, reliability in regard to ancient sources is of special importance.

The different ways in which *Light of the Soul* refers to Theophrastus is striking. Six of these ways are listed here.

- 1) In five texts, 167, 170, 179, 191 and 506, Theophrastus is referred to by name (not an abbreviation; see nos. 5 and 6 below) and without reference to a work.
- 2) In thirteen texts, 168, 178, 180, 190, 284, 286, 290, 291, 292, 342, 343, 344 and 448, Theophrastus is referred to by name and reference is made to the *liber Commentorum/Commentatorum*.
- 3) In one text, 250, Theophrastus is referred to by name and described as *commentator* on the *liber De quattuor transcendentibus*.
- 4) In three texts, 181, 267 and 289, Theophrastus is referred to by name and reference is made to a particular book: *liber De distinctionibus*

⁸⁸ See Chapter II, "The Sources" no. 16 p. 48 on 344.

⁸⁹ See 288 where we are told that the saints of God are fittingly designated by stars.

elementorum, *liber De parte sensitiva* and the *liber De virtute et potentia animalis*, respectively. There is no explicit reference to a commentator or commentary. But 267 should be compared with 344, where we read: *Theophrastus in Commentorum libro de parte sensitiva* (listed in no. 2 above).

- 5) In four texts, 288, 283, 287 and 285, Theophrastus is or appears to be referred to by the abbreviation *Theus* and with reference to a commentary or what might be a commentary: *in Commento*; *commentator super tertio (libro) De anima*; *super secundo (libro) De anima*, and *super III Posteriorum*, respectively.
- 6) In one text, 268, Theophrastus is or appears to be referred to by the abbreviation *The* and with reference to a commentary: *in Commento super De anima*.

How the titles occurring in these several passages relate to each other is problematic. I have already suggested above that 267 should be compared with 344. I.e., *liber De parte sensitiva* should be compared with *liber Commentorum de parte sensitiva*. We may have two separate works, but it seems more likely that the same work is being referred to. And if that is correct, how do the two titles relate to 268 *Commentum super De anima*, which appears as a separate entry in the list of psychological titles (265 no. 3). Do they refer to a part of the *Commentum super De anima*, or are they quite independent works?⁹⁰

A different case is 289. It refers to *liber De virtute et potentia animalis*.⁹¹ The title makes no mention of a commentary and might refer to a treatise on psychic capacity.⁹² Included will have been discussion of the way in which bright light or a weakened condition diminishes the capacity to see (289.1–3). Hence, the title has its own number in the list of titles referring to works on psychology (265 no. 2.) But it is also possible that the title refers to a section within a work entitled *On the Soul* (265 no. 1a). That idea receives some support from 287, for there reference is made to the second book of *On the Soul* in which the effects of light were discussed. But the use of *super* in the phrase *super secundo De anima* suggests a commentary on

⁹⁰ 268 tells us that in the *Commentary on the Soul*, Theophrastus declared successful Plato's proof of the immortality of the soul.

⁹¹ In context, *animalis* (ablative singular) is not a noun referring to a living creature; rather, it is an adjective derived from *anima*.

⁹² In the Latin title, the two nouns *virtus* and *potentia* may be used to translate the single Greek word δυνάμις. See Huby, *Commentary* 4 (1999) p. 288.

the second book.⁹³ And if that is the case, we might understand a phrase like *in commento* before *super* in 287. Indeed, that is what we read in a different text, 268, which has been mentioned above in regard to 267 and 344.

We seem to be going in a circle. Rather than continue, I suggest reminding ourselves that the *Lumen animae* is notoriously unreliable. Its references are frequently mistaken⁹⁴ and its use of abbreviations leaves us arguing on the basis of texts that might not be Theophrastean.⁹⁵ Moreover, its frequent references to a *Commentum* or *liber Commentorum* are not unambiguous. Are we to think of Theophrastean commentaries on some existing work,⁹⁶ or are we to understand the titles inclusively, so that they make room for memoranda, whose entries are not restricted to comments on existing works.⁹⁷ I prefer the latter, but there is no reason to think that the compiler of *Light of the Soul* was concerned with such distinctions. He was making a collection for preachers and found *Commentum* and *liber Commentorum* conveniently vague for his purposes.⁹⁸

no. 10 *Robe*] “Dunchad,” *Glosses on Martianus Capella* 5.433 p. 214.2 Dick (p. 40.25 Lutz) = 736A; John Scotus Eriugena, *On Martianus Capella* 1.10 p. 10.6 Dick (*Mid. and Ren. St.* vol. 1 [1941–1943] p. 189 Labowsky) = 582 and 5.435 p. 214.12 Dick (p. 110.14 Lutz) = 736B; Martin of Laon, *Glossary = Greek-Latin Glossary*

⁹³ Using *super* in conjunction with the title *De anima* avoids repeating *de*. That the compiler of *Light of the Soul* or his source had that in mind is possible but cannot be demonstrated.

⁹⁴ See Chapter II no. 16 p. 48 on 343, in which Aristotle's *Politics* and the ps.-Aristotelian *Problems* are cited mistakenly.

⁹⁵ Like 287 and 268 cited above.

⁹⁶ Presumably by another person like Aristotle or Plato.

⁹⁷ Sharples (1984) p. 188 and *Commentary* 5 (1995) p. 23.

⁹⁸ 285 might be cited as a paradigm of opaqueness. Theophrastus is not spelled out; instead, we have abbreviation: *Theus*. We might supply *in Commento* before *super* and construe the Roman numeral III as shorthand for *libro tertio*. But *Posteriorum* is a difficulty. In our translation of 285, we have added in parentheses *Analytics* together with a question mark. For persons familiar with the works of Aristotle, *Posteriorum* immediately suggests *Analyticorum*. But the Aristotelian work is only two books long. On the other hand, a *Posterior Analytics* in seven books is cited in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings (5.42 = 1.69 = 68 no. 7a), so that the numeral III might refer to Book 3 of the Theophrastean *Analytics*. Fair enough, but that brings into question the idea of understanding *in Commento* before *super*. If we think of a commentary, then Theophrastus would be writing a commentary on his own work. A collection of memoranda would be better. Theophrastus might draw on such a work for supplemental material when delivering lectures based on the seven book *Posterior Analytics*. But all that is guess work that might be deemed φλῶρις.

of Laon, cod. Laudunensis 444, fol. 289 (Usener, *Kl. Schr.* vol. 1 p. 192) = 735; Remigius of Auxerre, *On Martianus Capella* 5.435 p. 214.12 Dick (vol. 2 p. 70.20 Lutz) = 736C

Literature: Usener (1884) p. 158; Wendling (1891) p. 7; Lutz (1939) pp. 227–228; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1542; Moraux (1951) p. 188 n. 8, 196, 204, 238, 257, 270, 287; Schmitt (1971a) p. 315, (1971b) pp. 255–256; Sheldon-Williams (1973) p. 3; Jeaneau (1978) pp. 96–97, (1979) p. 6; Sollenberger (1984) pp. 392–394; Fortenbaugh (2005) pp. 165–169, 229–232; Sharples (2005) pp. 59–60

The title Πέπλος, *Robe*, is not found in Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Theophrastean writings, nor is it connected with Theophrastus in any writer of the Hellenistic period, the late Roman Republic, or the Roman Empire. It is found only in four writers of the Carolingian Renaissance (ninth century). 1) Martin of Laon cites the *Robe* as his source for a report concerning the origin and development of the alphabet. He also explains the name of Theophrastus as "understand god" (735).⁹⁹ 2) Commenting on the fifth book of Martianus Capella's work *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury*, "Dunchad"¹⁰⁰ refers to the *Robe* of Theophrastus as his source for a report concerning Corax, who is said to have invented the art of rhetoric (736A). 3) John Scotus Eriugena does the same when commenting on Martianus' fifth book (736B). In addition, while commenting on the first book, Eriugena cites the *Robe* as his source for a report concerning Apollo *qua* Pythian prophet (582). While commenting on the ninth book, Eriugena twice explains the name of Theophrastus, but without citing the *Robe* (6 and app. 6). 4) Like "Dunchad" and Eriugena, Remigius of Auxerre comments on Martianus' fifth book, cites the *Robe* as his source and identifies Corax as the inventor of rhetoric (736C). On three other occasions, Remigius mentions Theophrastus but without reference to the *Robe*. Commenting on Martianus fifth book, he refers to Macrobius for a report on Theophrastus' account of the Milky Way (app. 166). Commenting on the ninth book, he twice mentions Theophrastus without citing a work. On the first occasion, he is focused on a passage in which Theophrastus is named as someone who recognized the importance of musical harmony for effecting temperance in human beings. In this case, Remigius does nothing more than offer an explanation of the name (app. 6), which is quite close to one of the explanations given by Eriugena

⁹⁹ Earlier writers like Cicero, Strabo, Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius connect Theophrastus' name with his divine manner of speaking, i.e., in terms of λέξις or expression, and not with "understanding god". See below, Chapter IV "The Texts" on 735 pp. 178–179.

¹⁰⁰ On this use of scare quotes, see Chapter II "The Sources" no. 8 on Dunchad.

(6). On the second occasion, Remigius comments on Martianus' statement that Theophrastus used to apply, *adhibebat*, pipes to afflictions of the mind. What we are offered is not informative: *adhibebat* is explained by two synonyms (**app. 726A**).

Given the above, we can say that Theophrastus' name is explained four times: once by Martin, twice by Eriugena, and once by Remigius. But only once is the explanation found in a text that refers to the *Robe*, i.e., the text of Martin of Laon (735). At first reading, we might think that this reference to the *Robe* applies equally to the explanation of the name (lines 1–2) and to the report concerning Corax that follows in Martin's text (lines 3–8). Nevertheless, there is a different way to read the text: the reference to the *Robe* looks forward to the discussion of the alphabet and not to the immediately following explanation of Theophrastus' name. That explanation is, as it were, a parenthetical remark prompted by the reference to Theophrastus. If that is correct and I think it is, then we should not assume that Remigius' explanation of Theophrastus' name (**app. 6**) goes back to the *Robe*, even though the *Robe* is mentioned by Remigius in a different text (736C). So too the explanations given by Eriugena may derive from a source independent of the *Robe*. And since the explanations are closely related, especially that of Remigius and the first of Eriugena, which use words that are the same or cognate,¹⁰¹ it is tempting to think of a common source that underwent change in the course of transmission. Or perhaps Remigius drew directly on Eriugena and introduced minor changes in an attempt to make the explanation his own. Be that as it may, a different reason for denying that the explanations of Theophrastus' name go back to the *Robe* is that it would be odd for Theophrastus to explain his name in a work that he himself wrote. That said, it must be kept in mind that the *Robe* is a mysterious work and the attribution to Theophrastus is doubtful.

Remigius' report concerning Theophrastus' understanding of the Milky Way (**app. 166**) is of interest, for it makes clear that not all Carolingian references to Theophrastus are drawn from a Theophrastean work, at least not directly. For Remigius explicitly cites Macrobius as his source for Theophrastus' view of the Milky Way. Since we have the relevant text of Macrobius (*On Cicero's Dream of Scipio* 1.15.4), we can determine that Remigius has indeed followed Macrobius and done so with considerable accuracy. Whether Macrobius has reported Theophrastus' view correctly is another matter.

¹⁰¹ Remigius uses *expositor* and *exponens* (**app. 6**), while Eriugena has *expositio*, *exponens* and *expono* (6).

Certainly what he does report is out of line with Aristotle's view and suspect. On this report and two additional texts, in which Remigius names Theophrastus without referring to the *Robe* (app. 6 and 726A), see Chapter II "The sources" no. 11.

Given that a work entitled *Robe* is missing in Diogenes, catalogue of Theophrastean writings, that such a work is attributed to Theophrastus only in ninth century authors and that the report concerning Theophrastus' understanding of the Milky Way is suspect, one may wonder whether there ever was a genuine Theophrastean work entitled *Robe*. I am inclined to say that there never was such a work and that the *Robe* referred to by ninth century authors was a compilation that may have contained Theophrastean material but was not put together by Theophrastus himself. It postdates him, though it could belong to the Hellenistic period. Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that absence from Diogenes' catalogue is not of great significance (Theophrastus' *Metaphysics/On First Principles*¹⁰² is absent). Moreover, a work entitled *Robe* is attributed to Aristotle. But here, too, the evidence is late. The earliest reference is found in an author of the fourth and fifth century, namely, Socrates of Constantinople (*Ecclesiastical History* 3.23 = Aristotle, fr. 639 Rose³). Diogenes' catalogue of Aristotelian works does not have the title, but in the catalogue of Hesychius (sixth century), it occurs twice. In the opening part, which lists 139 titles, it occurs as no. 105 (p. 86 Düring),¹⁰³ and in the subsequent appendix, which lists 56 titles, it occurs as no. 169. In the later place, we read πέπλον· περιέχει δὲ ἱστορίαν σύμμικτον, "*Robe*: it contains a miscellaneous history" (p. 88 Düring).¹⁰⁴ The description is apt. At least, Aulus Gellius, (130–180 AD) in the preface to *Attic Nights*, says that his work contains a variety of subjects randomly organized and that one title among many for such a work is Πέπλος (pref. 2–6).¹⁰⁵ In

¹⁰² D. Gutas, *Theophrastus, On First Principles (known as his Metaphysics)* = *Philosophia Antiqua* 119 (Leiden: Brill 2010) pp. 25–32 makes an impressive case for accepting *On First Principles* as the correct title of Theophrastus' essay.

¹⁰³ It is first among the hypomnematic writings, which run from 105 to 119. See Düring p. 90. Gellius, *Attic Nights* pref. 8 lists *Memoriales* = Ὑπομνήματα along with *Peplos* as one of several titles appropriate to variegated collections. On Theophrastus' Ὑπομνήματα, see above on titles no. 6 and 7.

¹⁰⁴ Moraux p. 188 n. 8 sees in Hesychius' catalogue grounds for believing that prior to corruption the title *Robe* was listed in Diogenes' catalogue, which was written in five columns. *Robe* and four other titles were to be found at the bottom of the fourth column but fell out in transmission. Hesychius' catalogue, which goes back to the same original as that of Diogenes, has not suffered the same loss. That tells us that Diogenes' catalogue originally had the title *Robe*, and but for corruption it would be the earliest witness to an Aristotelian *Peplos*.

¹⁰⁵ See the preceding note. R. Marache, in the Budé edition of Aulus Gellius (1967) vol. 1

addition, the earliest use of πέπλος in regard to a literary composition is found in a letter of Cicero to Atticus (16.11.3) dating to the year 44 BC. In that letter, the compound word πεπλογραφία is used in regard to a work of Varro (116–27 BC), possibly the *Hebdomades or Images*, which treated well-known Greeks and Romans and was illustrated by 700 portraits (Pliny, *Natural History* 35.11). Also relevant, albeit not a writing or title, is the Πέπλος or Robe that the Athenians presented yearly to the goddess Athena. It was elaborately embroidered with mythological and historical figures. That invites comparison with what we know of the *Robe* attributed to Aristotle: it presented a mix of Greek heroes drawn from mythology and legend.¹⁰⁶ Modern scholars not only see a comparison but also assert that the title *Robe* derives from Athena's Robe.¹⁰⁷ Indeed, in the Loeb edition of Aulus Gellius, Rolfe translates Πέπλος with "Athena's Mantle."¹⁰⁸ For today's average reader that may seem something of a stretch, but an ancient reader would more than likely make the connection. And in doing so, he would respond positively not only to a witty connection but also to the dignity that Athena's Robe brings to the title and through the title to the work itself.¹⁰⁹

We may believe that there was a work of similar character, a miscellany, which was entitled *Robe* and attributed to Theophrastus. But even if that is correct, it remains an open question whether the work was genuine or a compilation that post-dated Theophrastus. And if it was a compilation, did it include material drawn from *On Discoveries*? Texts 735 and 736A–C all refer to the *Robe*, and all are concerned with discoveries: 735 with the discovery or invention of the alphabet and 736A–C with the invention of rhetoric. Or should we think that Theophrastus' *On Discoveries* and his *Robe* were one and the same work, the former title having been replaced in the ninth century or earlier by the title *Peplos*.¹¹⁰ Or perhaps we should

p. 227 n. 6 compares Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 6.1 2.1, where Πέπλος is listed among descriptive titles appropriate to variegated collections.

¹⁰⁶ Funerary epigrams, which by general agreement are not the work of Aristotle, were added to the *Robe* at a later date: see, e.g., Moraux p. 196 and M. Baumbach, "Peplos 2" in *Brill's New Pauly* 10 (2007) col. 737.

¹⁰⁷ See, e.g., C. Forbes, "Πέπλος 2," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 19 (1938) col. 561.

¹⁰⁸ J. Rolfe, *The Attic Nights* (Loeb ed. 1946) p. xxix.

¹⁰⁹ The connection with Athena may be primary, but we should not forget the πέπλος of Hera at Olympia, which was made anew every four years by sixteen women (Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 5.16.2).

¹¹⁰ That the title *Robe* might replace the title *On Discoveries* is suggested by Gellius' list of alternative titles for variegated collections, for there both *Robe* and *Discoveries* occur (pref. 6). Text 582 might be thought to tell against the idea, for it cites Theophrastus' *Robe* and focuses on the circumstances under which Apollo began to prophesy. The class of beginnings is more

question the existence of two works entitled *Robe*: one by Aristotle and one by Theophrastus. There may have been only one that was attributed now to Aristotle and now to Theophrastus. We can compare the Ὑπομνήματα, which in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings is accompanied by the qualifier "Aristotelian or Theophrastean" (727 no. 6). Or should we think of a work that was actually begun by Aristotle, that was left unfinished, and that was subsequently finished by Theophrastus, who made additions some of which contradicted his teacher?¹¹¹ Such speculation can be interesting, but without new evidence certainty will remain elusive.

- no. 11 *On Discoveries*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.47 = 1.199; Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.16 77.1 = 728.4; Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 10.5.14 = app. 728; scholium on Homer's *Iliad* 1.449 = 730.4; scholium on Pindar's *Olympian Odes* 13.27 = 734.1

Literature: Spengel (1828) p. 4 n. 8; Schmidt (1839) pp. 36–37; Kleingünther (1933) pp. 143–151; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; Thraede (1962) col. 1208–1211, 1230–1232; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 5 pp. 83–84, vol. 7 pp. 110–111; Sollenberger (1984) pp. 312–313; Zhmud (2001) p. 14, (2006) pp. 42–44, 150; Wehrli-Wöhrle (2004) p. 539; Sharples (2005) pp. 54–63; Kaldellis (2012) 467 T 3

The title *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*, *On Discoveries*, is found in Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Theophrastean writings—it occurs in the third list, in which titles are not arranged alphabetically (5.47 = 1.199)—and in several other authors: Clement of Alexandria, who is perhaps a half century younger than Diogenes (728.4), Eusebius who was older perhaps by fifty years or more (app. 728), and two scholiasts, whose reports go back to the early Empire and to the Hellenistic period (730.4 and 734.1).¹¹²

In the title, the Greek word *εὐρημάτων* has been translated with "discoveries." That is not wrong, but it should be kept in mind that the Greek word *εὑρημα* covers not only discovery but also invention,¹¹³ and in English the words "discovery" and "invention" are not exact synonyms. As a result, there

inclusive than the class of discoveries or inventions, but we do not know whether the material discussed in *On Discoveries* was rigorously limited to discoveries and inventions narrowly construed.

¹¹¹ See Wendling p. 7 and below, Chapter IV "The Texts" on 733.

¹¹² Clement belongs to the second half of the second century AD and Diogenes to the early third century; Eusebius lived c. 260–339 AD. On the scholia, see Chapter II "The Sources" no. 13 and 14 on Homer and on Pindar.

¹¹³ On the inclusive use of *εὐρήματα* and *εὐρεταί* in works *περὶ εὐρημάτων*, see, e.g., Kleingünther p. 1.

are texts, in which it is tempting to vary the translation of the title. I cite 734, which runs: καὶ Θεόφραστος μὲν¹¹⁴ ἐν Περὶ εὐρημάτων Ὑπέρβιον τὸν Κορίνθιον φησι εὐρηκέναι τὴν τοῦ κεραυμεικοῦ τροχοῦ μηχανήν, “And Theophrastus indeed in his *On Discoveries*, says that Hyperbius of Corinth discovered the device of the potter’s wheel.” Here it seems more natural to translate the verb εὐρηκέναι with “invented.” Hyperbius did not come upon the potter’s wheel, rather he considered how best to make moist clay rotate and created a wheel that holds clay and turns.¹¹⁵ Perhaps, then, we should change the translation of the verb to “invented” and for consistency change the title to “*On Invention*.” Tempting but also confusing. The incautious reader might think that two different translations render two different titles that refer to two different works. I prefer, therefore, to stay with one translation for the title, but in dealing with content and context, I shall not hesitate to speak of invention and to use the cognate verb wherever it seems appropriate.

A particular concern is when and where the phrase περὶ εὐρημάτων should be written with an upper case pi and hence as the title of a work, i.e., *On Discoveries*. In the text-translation volumes, upper case pi appears not only in Diogenes’ list of Theophrastean writings but also in the other texts that refer to Theophrastus as the author of a work on discoveries. Certainly the upper case pi is correct in Diogenes’ list (that holds even if we think that the titles postdate Theophrastus), and there is no good reason to deny that the scholiasts who refer to Theophrastus’ work are doing so by title (730.4, 734.1). Clement’s text is another matter (*Patchwork* 1.16 77.1 = 728), for there Theophrastus is referred to in line 1 after Scamon of Mytilene, whereas the phrase περὶ εὐρημάτων occurs in line 4 following a reference to Strato. If an upper case pi is printed in line 4, then a work carrying the title *On Discoveries* is attributed not only to Theophrastus and Strato but also to Aristotle.¹¹⁶ To my knowledge, no other passage tells us that Aristotle wrote a work entitled *On Discoveries*. To be sure, Aristotle will have mentioned and discussed discoveries in various works (both esoteric and exoteric works¹¹⁷), and a later

¹¹⁴ On καὶ ... μὲν, see the Chapter IV “The Texts” on 734 pp. 173–174.

¹¹⁵ The Greek noun μηχανή has been translated “device” for it suggests a mechanism that has been created by an inventor.

¹¹⁶ The use of plural τοῖς in line 4 (ἐν τοῖς Περὶ εὐρημάτων) suggests strongly that Clement is not just referring to the last named person, Strato, but rather to the entire list beginning with Scamon, on whom see below Chapter IV on text 728, p. 143 n. 20.

¹¹⁷ An interesting example from the esoteric works is found in the *Poetics* 4 1449a15–24, where Aristotle tells us that Aeschylus was πρῶτος, “first,” to introduce a second actor and Sophocles a third, after which Aristotle goes on to discuss *inter alia* meter. He says, λέξεως δὲ γενομένης αὐτῇ ἡ φύσις τὸ οἰκεῖον μέτρον εὔρε, “when speech became (part of tragedy)

editor may have included some or all of this material in the so-called *Robe* (see above, the commentary on title no. 10), but that is not grounds for asserting that Aristotle wrote a work entitled *On Discoveries*.

In regard to Strato, we can say that Clement mentions him twice as a writer on discoveries: once in the passage under consideration (*Patchwork* 1.16 77.1 = fr. 85 Sharples) and once concerning the attribution of the saying “Nothing in excess” (1.14 61.1 = fr. 86).¹¹⁸ Moreover, we read in the list of sources at the beginning of Pliny’s *Natural History* that Strato attacked in writing the discoveries of Ephorus, *contra Ephori εὐρημάτα scripsit* (1.7 = fr. 84), presumably in regard to (but not necessarily limited to) Anarchasis as the inventor of the potter’s wheel. See Strabo, who criticizes Ephorus for attributing the potter’s wheel to Anacharsis (*Geography* 7.3.9 = FGtH 70 fr. 42). That might encourage printing Περὶ (upper case pi) in the passage from Clement, but it is discouraged by Diogenes’ catalogue of Strato’s writings. For there we find the title Εὐρημάτων ἔλεγχοι δύο, which Sharples translates “Two Refutations on Discoveries” (*Lives* 5.60 = fr. 82 no. 10). My guess is that there was only one work and that work involved *inter alia* criticism of Ephorus’ remarks on the potter’s wheel.¹¹⁹

The occurrence of δύο, “two,” in the title of Strato’s work merits attention, for in Diogenes’ catalogue of Theophrastean works, we have Περὶ εὐρημάτων α’β’ (1.199). The occurrence of the numerals α’β’ contrasts with the word δύο, so that it seems natural to understand α’β’ and δύο differently. The numerals α’β’ refer to two books or scrolls and in doing so give us a rough indication of the length of the Theophrastean work. The word δύο is not a reference to two books or rolls. Rather, it is part of the title and should be taken closely with ἔλεγχοι: hence the translation of Sharples: *Two Refutations on Discoveries*. If that is correct, then the title of Strato’s work would seem to refer to a writing

nature herself discovered the appropriate meter.” For an example from the exoteric works, I cite Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 8.57. There we read, Ἀριστοτέλης δ’ ἐν τῷ Σοφιστῇ φησι πρῶτον Ἐμπεδοκλέα ῥητορικὴν εὐρεῖν, “Aristotle in the *Sophist* says that Empedocles first discovered rhetoric.” As in the previous example, so here the adjective πρῶτος and the verb εὐρεῖν makes one think of writings περὶ εὐρημάτων. But the passages hardly justify the claim that Aristotle wrote a work entitled *On Discoveries*. Indeed, in the second example, specific reference is made to the *Sophist*, which is likely to have been an early dialogue. See *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) pp. 163–165.

¹¹⁸ On this saying, see below, “The Texts” on 738.5.

¹¹⁹ Hence, I am reluctant to follow Zhmud (2006) p. 42 n. 88, when he credits Strato with a work entitled Περὶ εὐρημάτων. That said, I am not claiming that Diogenes’ catalogue decides the issue in favor of *Two Refutations on Discoveries*, Both titles might be descriptive titles that postdate Strato. But forced to choose, I much prefer the title recorded by Diogenes. The issue recurs below, p. 144 on 728.

of limited scope: two refutations in one relatively short book or scroll. Since some Peripatetic works were quite short (*see the introduction to this chapter*), there is no strong reason to reject this understanding of the text. Nevertheless, it should be noted that at the beginning of Diogenes' catalogue of Strato's writings, there are five titles each of which ends with an indication of the number of books or rolls (5.59). In Dorandi's edition (taken over by Sharples as fr. 1), none of the numbers are expressed by numerals. Rather we have the word *τρία* at the end of the first four titles and *τρία ἢ δύο* at the end of the fifth title. In Hick's edition (Loeb), the first two titles have the word *τρία* and the next three have one or two numerals: either *γ'* or *γ' ἢ β'* (cf. Sharples fr. 17 and 82). And Wehrli prints the numeral *γ'* at the end of the third and fourth titles, the word *τρία* at the end of the first and second title, and the words *τρία ἢ δύο* at the end of the fifth.¹²⁰ Recognizing that editions and the manuscripts on which the editions are based exhibit variation, it seems risky to put much weight on the occurrence of *δύο* as against *α'β'* occurring in the final position of the title that concerns us. That said, I find it hard to imagine two books or scrolls devoted entirely (or largely) to refuting attributions of discovery, so that I am tempted to stay with Sharples and to translate *Two Refutations on Discoveries*. But that could be a mistake, for it is not clear how *ἐλεγχοί* should be understood. Sharples prefers "refutations," but Hicks in the Loeb edition translates with "examinations" and Wehrli in his commentary opts for "lists."¹²¹ The last has an immediate appeal. Construing *ἐλεγχοί* as referring to lists is good Greek (LSJ s.v. B.IV) and the phrase *εὐρημάτων ἐλεγχοί* understood as "lists of discoveries" is a plausible title for a work on discoveries, for such works seem to have collected numerous reports stating that X discovered Y. Moreover, if *ἐλεγχοί* is understood as "lists," then it seems reasonable to understand *δύο* in the final position as an indication of the number of books, in the same way that *τρία* refers to the number of books at the beginning of Diogenes' catalogue. There is still another possibility: namely, that the title is corrupt, but I prefer not to go there.¹²² Instead, I leave the matter open and recommend printing a lower case pi in 728.

4.

¹²⁰ Wehrli vol. 5 p. 12.

¹²¹ Wehrli vol. 5 p. 83, where he writes: *Der Titel "Ελεγχοί im Sinne von Liste, Zusammenstellung.*

¹²² It may be, e.g., that material has been lost, so that two titles now appear as one. Or to take a different tack, it may be that the title is misleading in that it refers only to the opening sections or chapters of the work. Interesting possibilities, perhaps, but pursuing such speculations would be otiose.

Heraclides of Pontus, who is reported to have studied under Aristotle (Sotion, ap. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.86 = fr. 1.4–5 Schütrumpf) but is properly regarded as a member of the Academy,¹²³ wrote a work *On Discoveries*. In Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Heraclides' writings, the work comes last, being placed under the heading ἱστορικά along with a work entitled *On the Pythagoreans* (5.88 = fr. 1.62–63 = 17 no. 50 and 51). The heading does not imply history in the narrow sense of political and military events. It tells us only that two of Heraclides' works contained the results of research, i.e., materials that Heraclides had sought out and published and that might be used in other works or when lecturing on a variety of topics. In the case of *On the Pythagoreans*, the title announces the unifying element, and the same is true of the title *On Discoveries*. The work will have reported who discovered/invented what. In Orion's *Etymologicum*, there is a text that might derive from *On Discoveries*. It tells us that Pheidon was the πρῶτος πάντων, "first of all" to mint coinage in Aegina. Moreover, when Pheidon distributed the coinage, he collected the jagged nails that were used to determine weight and he dedicated the nails to Hera. That is followed by an explanation of the words δραχμή, "drachma," and ὀβολοστάτης, "obol-weigher," i.e., the petty usurer. In conclusion, Orion adds, "Thus (says) Heraclides of Pontus" (cod. Parisinus 2653, p. 118 Sturz = fr. 144 Schütrumpf). Assuming that the Heraclides in question is the older Heraclides and not his younger name-sake who was a grammarian,¹²⁴ and on the assumption that the text from πρῶτος πάντων to the concluding reference to Heraclides of Pontus is drawn from *On Discoveries* (which has not been demonstrated), then we have an example of a work *On Discoveries* that added explanatory material to the simple assertion X was first to do Y. But even *if* that is correct, it must be acknowledged that without additional texts that refer to *On Discoveries*, it is impossible to say how extensive the collection was and how much discussion or explanation might have accompanied the reports.

¹²³ That Heraclides heard Aristotle lecture need not be denied, but Diogenes errs in placing his biography among those of the Peripatetics (5.86–94). Indeed, Heraclides was a serious candidate for the headship of the Academy when Speusippus died (Heraclides lost by only a few votes; Philodemus, *History of the Academy* pp. 136–137 Dorandi = fr. 10 Schütrumpf), which could hardly be true were he a member of the Peripatetic School. See, e.g. J. Mejer, "Heraclides Intellectual Context," in *Heraclides of Pontus: Discussion*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Pender (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2009) = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 15 p. 29.

¹²⁴ The assumption is defended by both Wehrli (1967–1978) pp. 110–111 and by Schütrumpf in his edition of the fragments (2008) p. 255.

The heading ἱστορικά in Diogenes' catalogue of Heraclides writings (5.88) invites comparison not only with Clement's use of ἱστορεῖν, *re vera* ἱστώρησαν in regard to Theophrastus and others, who wrote works on discoveries (1.16 = 728.4), but also with three Theophrastean titles 'Ἱστορικῶν γεωμετρικῶν α'–δ', Ἀστρολογικῆς ἱστορίας α'–ς' and Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ αὐξήσεως α', 4 Books of *Geometrical Researches*, 6 Books of *Astronomical Research* and 1 Book of *Arithmetical Researches on Increase*, which Diogenes includes in his catalogue of Theophrastean writings (5.48 = 1.245 = 264 no. 3, 5.50 = 1.271 = 137 no. 43 and 5.50 = 1.272 = 264 no. 2). I have already mentioned these titles in the introduction to this chapter, pointing out that the attribution to Theophrastus has been challenged (certain scholars attribute the titles to Eudemus of Rhodes¹²⁵) and that there are competing views concerning the content of the works to which the titles refer. The works may be historical in that they trace the development over time of three different branches of mathematics, or they may contain detailed research into a variety of mathematical problems. Here I want to underline that on either of these interpretations, the three titles refer to works quite different from Peripatetic works *On Discoveries*. As their name indicates, works *On Discoveries* are fundamentally catalogues of who discovered what. The focus is on traditional reports concerning the past, often the prehistoric/mythological past (Prometheus is said to have been the first to give men a share in philosophy 729).¹²⁶ In contrast, a work on the history of mathematics is fundamentally scientific. It might take its start from the prehistoric period and from non-Greeks like the Egyptians, but the primary aim is to establish actual developments and to do so while taking account of chronological order. And a work that deals with particular mathematical problems is not focused on the past, either prehistoric or historical. It investigates problems and reports solutions. To be sure, the dividing lines are not clear-cut. A historical work will report particular investigations that have produced certain solutions, and a work that reports research focused on particular problems need not avoid historical remarks. But the focus is different, as is that of Peripatetic works *On Discoveries*.

In conclusion, I add a caveat concerning our sources: It may well be correct that Theophrastus' work *On Discoveries* was little more than a

¹²⁵ See above, this Chapter p. 70.

¹²⁶ In the text-translation volumes, we translated ἱστώρησαν with "recorded" (728.4, cf. LSJ s.v. II). On the whole, the authors named will have recorded numerous traditional reports that were often based on mythology and were not intended to be understood as the fruit of careful/scientific research that took account of controls such as chronology, context and contradictory reports.

catalogue of who discovered what, stated cursorily and often in no special order, but the surviving evidence is woefully meager (in the case of Theophrastus only three texts refer explicitly to *On Discoveries* [728, 730, 734]¹²⁷), and Strato is said to have taken issue with Ephorus concerning matters of discovery. Indeed, Strato may have written a work that focused on or at least included refutations. And if that is correct, the surviving evidence may not give an adequate picture of Theophrastus' work *On Discoveries*. In addition to cataloguing who discovered what, it is at least conceivable that the Theophrastean work made room for comments on chronology and disputed attribution. For example, Theophrastus may have taken a cue from Aristotle's *Poetics* and recorded not only competing claims concerning the origin of comedy but also chronological considerations that favor one claimant over the other (3 1448a31–34).¹²⁸

666 *On Invention*] Georgius Choeroboscus, *On Hephaestion's Handbook* 5.10.2 no. 4 (p. 240.19–20 Consbruch)

Literature: Fortenbaugh (2005) pp. 69–72

In the text-translation volumes, the title *Περὶ εὐρήσεως*, *On Invention*, has been placed among the rhetorical titles (vol. 2 pp. 508–509) and referred to from the list of miscellaneous titles (vol. 2 pp. 584–585). The title does not occur in Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. Rather, it is found in Consbruch's edition of the work *On Hephaestion's Handbook* by George the Swineherd. In the relevant passage (5.10.2 p. 240.19–20 Consbruch), George is concerned to condemn the word *εὔρεμα* as an alternate form of *εὕρημα*, and in this context he refers to Theophrastus. The text runs as follows:

ἰστέον οὖν ὅτι τινὲς εὔρεμά φασιν, ὅπερ οὐ δεῖ. εἴρηται μὲν γὰρ καὶ εὕρησις καὶ εὔρεσις, καὶ Ἀττικοὶ τινες ἑκατέρως φασίν· ἔστι γὰρ σύγγραμμα παρὰ Θεοφράστῳ Περὶ εὐρήσεως· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ “ε” ἐν ἰάμβῳ “οὐχ εὔρεσις τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ἀφαίρεσις” ἐν τοῖς Ἐπιτρέπουσι. καὶ εὕρημα διὰ τοῦ “η”· “εὕρημα δ' οὐκ οἶσθ' οἷον εὕρηκας τόδε.” οὐ μὴν διὰ τοῦ “ε” εὔρεμα.

4 Περὶ εὐρήσεως *coni. Caesar*: Περὶ εὐρέσεως *codd.*

¹²⁷ I am not counting Eusebius, who is dependent on Clement. See the upper apparatus of parallel texts to 728.

¹²⁸ For completeness' sake, I note that in the nineteenth century, Spengel p. 4 n. 8 included Περὶ εὐρημάτων among the rhetorical titles, but Spengel has been refuted by Schmidt pp. 36–37 and Regenbogen col. 1535.

One should know that some people say εὑρεμα ("discovery"), which is not correct. For both εὑρησις and εὑρεσις were used, and some Attic writers say both; for there is a treatise by Theophrastus Περί εὐρήσεως (*On Discovery/Invention*). But epsilon is used in the iambic line, "This is not εὑρεσις (discovery), but robbery," in the *Arbitrants*. And εὑρημα with eta, "You do not know what sort of discovery it is you have discovered." Not indeed εὑρεμα with an epsilon.

The text of George is faulty, for in the sentence in which Theophrastus is named, the manuscripts offer Περί εὐρέσεως (with epsilon and not eta) as the title of the Theophrastean work. Context, however, seems to require Περί εὐρήσεως (with eta), which has been printed by Consbruch, following Caesar. Exactly what the fault is and who might be responsible is problematic.

It is clear that George is opposing the use of εὑρεμα (with epsilon). He prefers εὑρημα (with eta) and finds support in the cognate word εὑρησις. He acknowledges that both εὑρησις and εὑρεσις are used by certain Attic writers, after which he offers an example of each. First comes the Theophrastean title. Assuming that the title is meant to support George's preference, Περί εὐρήσεως is the correct reading. After that and introduced by ἀλλά, "but," comes a line of Menander in which εὑρεσις occurs (*Arbitrants* 180). George then returns to his initial concern: the improper use of εὑρεμα. He quotes a line of Euripides, in which εὑρημα occurs (*Medea* 716), and concludes: "Not indeed εὑρεμα." All that seems straightforward, but the argument requires emending the transmitted Greek text, in which the title of the Theophrastean work is Περί εὐρέσεως (with epsilon). The title must be emended to read Περί εὐρήσεως (with eta). But that is improbable, for εὑρεσις was the common Attic form, which we find in, e.g., Aristotle (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.3 112a27, b19, 7.2 1146b8).¹²⁹ If one ignores the flow of the argument, then the codices have it right: Theophrastus wrote a work entitled Περί εὐρέσεως. Something seems to have gone wrong. Pressed to offer a suggestion, I would point to the fact that George's commentary is purported to be a student's report of what George said in lecture.¹³⁰ It might be that the student in question nodded and omitted examples that would make it possible to maintain the manuscript reading Περί εὐρέσεως and still have a connected argument. Perhaps George gave examples of εὑρησις (with eta) before and after the

¹²⁹ See also Plato's *Phaedrus* 236A3–6, cited below toward the end of this comment. According to LSJ, εὑρησις is the "worse form of εὑρεσις." Apollo Mythographicus (1st or 2nd century AD) is cited for εὑρησις.

¹³⁰ The heading in codex Parisinus Graecus suppl. 1198 fol. 20^v tells us that the commentary on Hephaestion is ἀπὸ φωνῆς Γεωργίου, from the voice of George, i.e., taken down during lecture.

Theophrastean title (the latter would fit the use of ἀλλά). Perhaps he even included an example of certain Attic writers who used both εὔρεσις and εὔρησις. But such speculation leaves one uncomfortable.

In *Commentary* 8 (2005) on Theophrastus' rhetoric, I did not recommend that any changes be made, should there be a second edition of the text-translation volumes. In particular, I did not recommend changing the title as printed in 666 no. 4, i.e., changing Περί εὔρησεως to Περί εὔρέσεως. Nor did I suggest that a new edition of George's *On Hephaestion's Handbook*, should move Caesar's emendation to the critical apparatus and print Περί εὔρέσεως in the body of the text. That may have been too cautious. Given that no manuscript exhibits the emendation advanced by Caesar and given that the manuscript reading is almost certainly what Theophrastus would have written, I now prefer changing 666 no. 4 to read Περί εὔρέσεως, albeit making clear that Consbruch's edition reads otherwise. A new editor of *On Hephaestion's Handbook* might do well to print the transmitted text, to mark corruption with a crux and to use the critical apparatus not only to record Caesar's emendation but also to make clear that the problem may go beyond a single word. In the remainder of this comment, I shall refer to Theophrastus' Περί εὔρέσεως.

The title Περί εὔρέσεως will have referred to a work on discovery/invention. We know that Theophrastus wrote a work entitled Περί εὔρημάτων, *On Discoveries* (727 no. 11), whose focus was on "firsts," i.e., "who discovered what." The title is listed in Diogenes' catalogue (5.47 = 1.199), and there are texts that not only refer to *On Discoveries* but also provide an idea of the discoveries/inventions that were catalogued in the Theophrastean work: in particular, the grinder and the potter's wheel (730.5, 734.2). There are still other texts that do not refer to *On Discoveries* by title but nevertheless provide a fuller indication of the kinds of firsts that were included: structures like walls and towers (732), a technical procedure like alloying bronze (731), an aesthetic art like painting (733) and an intellectual activity like philosophy (729). Apparently *On Discoveries* will have been an inclusive work that took account of man's cultural achievements broadly construed. And if that is correct, it is tempting to say that Περί εὔρέσεως was an alternative title for Περί εὔρημάτων or perhaps a section within Περί εὔρημάτων, i.e., a section on investigation as a process that results in discoveries and inventions of various kinds.

There is, however, another possibility: namely, that the work Περί εὔρέσεως was focused on rhetorical invention, i.e., discovering what needs to be said if an oration is going to accomplish its purpose: prevailing in court, convincing the assembly, or enhancing the accomplishments of a distinguished

person or people. We find εὑρεσις and the cognate verb εὕρισκειν used of finding appropriate arguments in Plato's *Phaedrus* (236A3–6), and the verb is used in a similar manner by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* (1.2 1356a1, 2.20 1394a3, 3.17 1418a26). The Theophrastean evidence is meager, but there is one text in which the verb is used of finding what needs to be said. I am thinking of a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Alcibiades* 10.3, where Alcibiades is described as most capable at finding out what needs to be said: εὕρεῖν ... τὰ δέοντα (705.2). These passages taken together suggest to me that Theophrastus may have decided to use εὑρεσις as a kind of *terminus technicus* to refer to finding and constructing the technical proofs of Aristotelian rhetoric: persuasion through argument, emotion and character. He may also have formulated a four-part rhetoric in terms of εὑρεσις, λέξις, τάξις and ὑπόκρισις.¹³¹ And if that is correct, Theophrastus may have decided to write a separate treatise *Περὶ εὐρέσεως*, much as he wrote separate treatises entitled *Περὶ λέξεως* and *Περὶ ὑποκρίσεως*. That thinking stands behind our decision to list *Περὶ εὐρέσεως* among the rhetorical titles and not among the miscellaneous titles immediately after *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*.

no. 12 *On the Wise Men*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.48 = 1.243

Literature: Usener (1858) p. 10; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 4 p. 69; Sollenberger (1984) pp. 333–334; Bollansée (1999b) p. 32; Althoff-Zeller (2006) p. 17

The title *Περὶ τῶν σοφῶν*, *On the Wise Men*, is found in the second list of Diogenes' Catalogue of Theophrastean writings, where it is reported to have been one book or roll in length. No other ancient source attributes a work with this title to Theophrastus. Usener suggested supplying the numeral ζ' before σοφῶν, thereby narrowing the title to the so-called Seven Sages.¹³² That has a certain appeal, when one considers that Plato recognized Seven Sages (*Protagoras* 343A) and that Demetrius of Phalerum, Theophrastus' student within the Peripatos (18 no. 5), made a collection of sayings that are distributed among seven different sages. The collection is found in Stobaeus' *Anthology* under the heading Δημητρίου Φαληρέως τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα, "*Sayings of the Seven Sages* by Demetrius of Phalerum"

¹³¹ If Theophrastus did formulate a four-part rhetoric, then he will have anticipated the Stoics who divided rhetoric into εὑρεσις, φράσις (= λέξις), τάξις and ὑπόκρισις (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.43).

¹³² The phrase "Seven Sages" is often used by English speaking scholars and others as well to refer to the Seven Wise Men. On who these persons were, see the next paragraph.

(3.1.172 [vol. 3 p. 111.8 Hense] = fr. 114 W = fr. 87 Stork).¹³³ Moreover, in the apparatus to his edition of Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings, Usener refers to Plutarch's *Life of Solon* 4, in which we read that Theophrastus told the story of the golden tripod that was passed around the Seven Sages, each declining it in favor another whom he deemed wiser (583).¹³⁴ No Theophrastean work is specified, but it is not impossible that he told the story in the work *On the Wise Men*. And if that possibility is accepted, it is tempting to add "Seven" to the Theophrastean title found in Diogenes. Nevertheless, the supplement proposed by Usener lacks manuscript support and is advanced with hesitation. It is mentioned only in the critical apparatus to Usener's edition of Diogenes' catalogue, and it is introduced with the qualifier *fort.*, i.e., *fortasse*, "perhaps." To my knowledge, no later editor has accepted the supplement and incorporated it in the text.

More importantly, there was variation in the individuals who were included among the Seven Sages. Plato lists Thales of Miletus, Pittacus of Mytilene, Bias of Priene, Solon of Athens, Cleobulus of Lindus, Myson of Chen and Chilo of Sparta. In Demetrius' collection, six of these seven reappear, but Myson is replaced by Periander of Corinth. In addition, Dicaearchus, Theophrastus' contemporary within the Peripatos, is said to have recognized four individuals who are agreed upon: Thales, Bias, Pittacus and Solon. He named six others: not only Chilo, Cleobulus and Periander but also Aristodemus, Pamphylus and Anacharsis.¹³⁵ of whom three were to be selected (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.41 = Dicaearchus 32 W. = fr. 38 Mirhady).¹³⁶ Little more than a century after Demetrius and Dicaearchus, Hermippus wrote a work *Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν*, in which he is said to have listed seventeen individuals, from whom different people made their own selection of Seven

¹³³ P. Stork et al. "Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text and Translation" in *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text Translation and Discussion*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 9 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2000) pp. 154–165. On the use of ἀποφθέγματα in the heading, see below, Chapter IV "The Texts" on 738 pp. 216–218.

¹³⁴ Two versions of the story are told. One in which the tripod was first sent to Thales and a second in which the first recipient was Bias. The second version is attributed to Theophrastus.

¹³⁵ Aristodemus was a Spartan and Anacharsis a Scythian. Pamphylus is an obscure figure, for whom there is no entry in *Paulys Realencyclopädie*.

¹³⁶ D. Mirhady, "Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text and Translation" in *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation, and Discussion*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf = Rutgers Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 10 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2001) pp. 36–37.

Sages (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.42 = fr. 6 Wehrli).¹³⁷ Whether Theophrastus made such a selection is nowhere reported; indeed, he may have preferred the short title *Περὶ τῶν σοφῶν* (without *ἐπτὰ*), because he thought that the list of candidates was such that it precluded a neat cut off at seven.¹³⁸

Comparison with the lists of sayings found in Stobaeus' *Anthology* under the heading "*Sayings of the Seven Sages* by Demetrius of Phalerum" suggests that Theophrastus is likely to have included lists of sayings in his work *On the Wise Men*. If he did, we would like to know whether he divided up the sayings as far as possible in order to avoid or at least to minimize assigning the same saying to more than one person. Or did he recognize that sayings are movable (readily attributed to more than one individual¹³⁹) and that tradition had the Seven Sages coming together at various places including Delphi,¹⁴⁰ where they offered to the god the fruits of their wisdom and inscribed there the sayings "Know yourself" and "Nothing in excess" (Plato, *Protagoras* 343A–B)? Be that as it may, he will have recognized that the sayings of the Sages were on the whole memorable not only for the wisdom conveyed but also for their Laconian brevity and pithiness (cf. 342E–343B).¹⁴¹ We may compare two rhetorical texts of Theophrastus, in one of which the use of Laconian sayings is recommended (676.28). In the other, the use of compact expression is treated as a virtue of style (695.3–4).¹⁴² Whether Theophrastus referred to his work *On Style* from the work *On Wise Men* or *vice versa* cannot be known, but it seems reasonable to say that *On Wise Men* will have contained material that might have been called on during lecture on rhetorical style.

¹³⁷ On Hermippus see the introduction to this chapter, above pp. 68–69. The title of Hermippus' work is reported as *Περὶ τῶν σοφῶν* only in fr. 6 Wehrli = F 20 Bollansée. Elsewhere *ἐπτὰ* is included in the title: fr. 13, 15a, 16 W = 11, 12a, 9 B. For discussion of Hermippus' work, see Bollansée (1999a) commentary on F 9–20 and (1999b) pp. 27–44.

¹³⁸ Given the number of candidates, one might expect the idea of Seven Sages to have been abandoned, but the number seven persisted, in part through the Sages' close association with Delphi and the god Apollo, to whom the number seven was sacred. So Bollansée (1999b) p. 28, citing O. Barkowski, "Sieben Weise," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* vol. 2A (1923) col. 2247, 2251–2252 and Wehrli vol. 9² pp. 69–70.

¹³⁹ Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.41, where we are told that the sayings of the Sages were disputed and that people attribute them now to one and now to another.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Diogenes Laertius 1.40.

¹⁴¹ I have written "on the whole," for there are exceptions. For an example, I cite the list of sayings attributed to Pittacus by Demetrius of Phalerum (fr. 87 no. 5 p. 160 Stork). The first eleven exhibit brevity but the twelfth is a list whose length is noticeable.

¹⁴² The use of *συσπρέφουσα* at 695.3 invites comparison with the use of *συνεστραμμένον* in *Protagoras* 342E.

In the *Protagoras*, Plato has Socrates discuss a poem of Simonides, in which the poet criticizes a saying of Pittacus, who is called σοφός, “wise,” (339C). The saying runs Χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι, “It is hard to be noble” (PMG fr. 542.13 Page).¹⁴³ It is said to have circulated privately and to have been praised by the wise. In addition, Simonides’ motive in criticizing the saying of Pittacus is said to have been a desire to win a reputation for wisdom. He believed that if he were able to bring down the saying, then he would become famous in the way that victory over a famous athlete brings renown (343C). Whether this characterization of Simonides is fair need not concern us. The important point is that the general idea of gaining a reputation for wisdom by proving wrong an opinion that has gained wide acceptance is sensible and finds recognition in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, where the philosopher recommends using maxims that contradict sayings that have become part of the public domain (2.21 1395a20–23).¹⁴⁴ Theophrastus will not have been ignorant of Plato’s *Protagoras*, and given his interest in rhetoric he will have known well what Aristotle said concerning gnomic sayings. That he picked up on his predecessors and in his work *On the Wise Men* made a similar point about refuting the sayings of the wise, cannot be proven, but he may well have done so or perhaps in another work like *On the Maxim* (666 no. 7) or *On Proverbs* (727 no. 14).

The Seven Sages were not philosophers in the mold of Plato and Aristotle. Dicaearchus makes the point when he says that they were neither wise nor philosophers but rather shrewd men and lawgivers, συνετοὺς δέ τινας καὶ νομοθετικούς (fr. 30 W = 37 Mirhady = Diogenes Laertius 1.40).¹⁴⁵ The various collections of sayings makes clear that they were concerned with practical affairs both in private life and in that of the city. Moreover, in a letter to Atticus, Cicero speaks of a great controversy between Dicaearchus and Theophrastus. The two Peripatetics are said to have disagreed concerning the value of the life of action and that of contemplation, the πρακτικὸς βίος and the θεωρητικὸς βίος. Dicaearchus championed the former and Theophrastus the latter (481). We can imagine this disagreement playing a role in the work entitled *On The Wise Men*.¹⁴⁶ And assuming that this work

¹⁴³ Cf. Polybius, *Histories* 29.26.1 and Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.76.

¹⁴⁴ See below, Chapter IV, the introduction to Section 2 “Proverbs” pp. 198–199.

¹⁴⁵ In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle explains συνετοί as persons who exhibit understanding in regard to practical matters (6.10 1142b34–1143a18). When Dicaearchus refers to the Seven Sages as συνετοί, he is using the adjective in much the same way as Aristotle does.

¹⁴⁶ It might be objected that the definite article “the” in the title *On the Wise Men* is restrictive. I.e. the work will have been narrowly focused on the Seven Sages and will not have wandered into a controversy, which presupposes Peripatetic moral philosophy and a

brought together many of the sayings attributed to the sages, we can imagine these sayings being introduced into the controversy on one side or the other. Or sayings like “Know Yourself” (738) and “Nothing is excess” (738.5) might have been introduced as part of an argument for adopting a middle ground between the two lives.¹⁴⁷ Interesting speculation, but the idea of a “great controversy” between Dicaearchus and Theophrastus is not to be taken seriously. See below p. 203.

no. 13 *Akikharos*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.50 = 1.273

Literature: Regenbogen (1940) col. 1541; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 4 p. 68; Lindenberger (1983) p. 5, (1985) p. 491; Daniel (1966) p. 34; Wilsdorf (1991) pp. 191–206; Kurke (2011) p. 177

The title Ἀκίχαρος α', *Acicharus* 1 book, occurs in the fourth list within Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. The list is arranged alphabetically; Ἀκίχαρος follows Ἀστρολογικῆς ἱστορίας α' β' γ' δ' ε' ζ' and Ἀριθμητικῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ αὐξήσεως α', both of which are disputed. I.e., certain scholars attribute the writings to Eudemus. That is a matter of considerable interest,¹⁴⁸ but it is not a good reason for doubting the attribution of a work entitled Ἀκίχαρος to Theophrastus.

In the text-translation volumes, the title Ἀκίχαρος is translated in two different ways. In dealing with Diogenes' catalogue, we followed our usual practice and printed the Latin equivalent: *Acicharus* (1.273). In dealing with the titles brought together under the heading “Miscellaneous Items,” we

view of contemplation that was foreign to the Sages. I am not certain that the definite article must be taken as limiting discussion to the Seven Sages. It may be directing our attention to those wise individuals who lived at various times and exhibited in their behavior a grasp of true wisdom. But even if “the” points toward the Seven Sages, it is easy to imagine their life styles being invoked on one side or the other of a debate concerning the relative values of differing life styles.

¹⁴⁷ Whereas text 481 takes no notice of a middle ground between the life of action and that of contemplation, it is clear that Theophrastus recognized the importance of family and civic involvement. See *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) pp. 393–396 on 481. In line with the saying “Know yourself,” Theophrastus could embrace the importance of divine intellect, νοῦς, and still recognize that a human being is more than intellect. Such a being may chose to maximize periods of contemplation, but equally he should understand that there is more to human life than reclusive contemplation. Moreover, the saying “Nothing in excess” becomes important when combined with the realization that continuous contemplation is impossible for a human being. A mixed life is not only the best choice but also a necessary choice for the person who wants to live well.

¹⁴⁸ See above, the introduction to this Chapter p. 70 and the commentary on title no. 8 p. 98.

printed *Akikharos*, which is a simple transliteration of the Greek (727 no. 13). Neither translation is wrong, but consistency is desirable. Should there be a second edition of the text-translation volumes, the Latin equivalent should be printed in both places.

The Theophrastean title refers to neither a Greek nor a Roman. Rather, it refers to a wise Aramean, who is said to have been a trusted advisor to the king of Syria, Sennacherib, at the beginning of the seventh century BC.¹⁴⁹ In the remainder of this comment, I shall follow the practice of specialists in Semitic studies, who refer to the advisor of Sennacherib as Ahiqar. That will serve two purposes. It underlines the fact that recent advances in our knowledge of Ahiqar are largely attributable to persons involved in Near Eastern Studies. It also avoids the issue of minor variations in the way Greek texts refer to Ahiqar. We need not decide between Theophrastus, who writes Ἀχίχαρος (so the title attributed to Theophrastus in Diogenes' catalogue), and Clement of Alexandria, who writes Ἀχίκαρος (the second kappa replaces the chi found in the Theophrastean title).¹⁵⁰ Problematic is Strabo, who refers to Ἀχαίκαρος (kappa and chi reversed, and alpha-iota instead of iota), but the reference may not be to Ahiqar, the wise Aramean.¹⁵¹

The story of Ahiqar, his wisdom and his escape from unjust condemnation, comes to us in various forms. Since the story is not well-known among Classicists, not to mention philosophers interested in the School of Aristotle, I give here in abbreviation the basic/composite story as reported by Lindenberger (1983) pp. 3–4.¹⁵² It divides into four parts: an initial narrative, followed by a series of proverbs; a second narrative and a final string of reproaches that focus on wrongful behavior. 1) As a young man, Ahiqar had been told by astrologers that he would be childless. That proved true,

¹⁴⁹ More precisely, 704–681 BC. So Lindenberger (1983) p. 3, (1985) p. 484.

¹⁵⁰ Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.15 69.4 reports that Democritus (68 B 299D–K) included in his own writings a translation of the stele of Ἀχίκαρος.

¹⁵¹ Strabo, *Geography* 16.2.39 refers to Ἀχαίκαρος in a list of inspired seers among the barbarians, but the identification of Ἀχαίκαρος with Ahiqar depends on emending a place name and has been criticized by Daniel p. 34, citing earlier criticism by Th. Nöldeke, "Untersuchungen zum Achiqar-Roman," *Abh. Königl. Gesellsch. Wiss. Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, NF 14.4 (Berlin 1913) pp. 20–25. Cf. Kurke p. 177.

¹⁵² Lindenberger (1983) p. 3 refers to his report as the "basic" story. I have added "composite" to take account of the fact that the Aramaic version, which survives imperfectly on a fifth century BC papyrus and which is translated by Lindenberger (1985) pp. 494–507, does not report everything included in Lindenberger's basic account. Following Lindenberger (1985) p. 498, Kurke p. 178 points out, in the Aramaic version the narrative breaks off with Ahiqar's brush with death and before his Egyptian adventure (on which see below). What is left is a fragmentary list of proverbs. See also Wilsdorf pp. 191–193.

despite serious efforts on the part of Ahiqar (he had taken fifty wives). Acting on the advice of an oracle, Ahiqar adopted his nephew Nadin (or Nadan) and proceeded to instruct the nephew in his own wisdom, in order that he might have a worthy successor. 2) At this point in the story come a string of proverbs that represent the wisdom conveyed to the young Nadin. 3) When the narrative resumes, much time has passed. Ahiqar is old and the nephew has rejected the wisdom in which he had been trained. In particular, he has turned against Ahiqar and fabricated a letter implicating his stepfather in treason. King Sennacherib reacted strongly by condemning Ahiqar to death. The man sent to carry out the king's judgment, turned out to be someone whom Ahiqar had rescued earlier from a similar judgment. Accordingly, he hid Ahiqar along with his wife (now only one), and for the corpse of Ahiqar he substituted one of a slave. Later the king of Egypt promised Sennacherib the entire revenue of Egypt for three years, were he to send him someone who could build a castle between the earth and the heavens. Sennacherib realized that Ahiqar was the best man for the task but believed him dead. Seeing an opportunity to bring Ahiqar out of hiding, the man who had rescued him revealed what he had done. Sennacherib responded by sending Ahiqar to Egypt, where he astounded the Egyptians with his wisdom. After three years Ahiqar returned to Assyria with the promised sum and in lieu of a reward asked to have Nadin handed over. The adopted son is imprisoned and 4) the narrative gives way to a series of reproaches, which caused Nadin to swell up and die.

The death of Nadin is the stuff of folklore, and scholars have generally regarded Ahiqar as a fictional figure. But the discovery of a cuneiform tablet listing court scholars of Babylonia and Assyria has prompted reconsideration.¹⁵³ Be that as it may, it now seems clear on stylistic grounds that the proverbs attributed to Ahiqar originated among the Aramaic speaking people of northern Syria and were at first independent of the narrative parts of the story. The latter may have been composed in order to give the proverbs context, or they may have had an earlier life of their own.

A version of the story of Ahiqar circulated in Greek.¹⁵⁴ It has not survived, but it will have influenced the assimilation of Ahiqar to Aesop, the writer of fables who lived during the first half of the sixth-century BC.¹⁵⁵ The

¹⁵³ See Lindenberger (1983) p. 22, (1985) p. 483.

¹⁵⁴ Lindenberger pp. 4–7.

¹⁵⁵ Despite what is said at the beginning of the *Life of Aesop*, Aesop was most likely a Thracian and not a Phrygian. For the ancient sources concerning Aesop, see B.E. Perry, *Aesopica* (Urbana: University of Illinois 1952) vol. 1 pp. 35–208 (*Vitae* G & W) and pp. 211–241

assimilation may have occurred as early as the fifth century, but whatever the date, there are striking similarities between the story of Ahiqar and a self-contained segment¹⁵⁶ of the anonymous *Life of Aesop*,¹⁵⁷ I am referring to the segment, in which Aesop is said to have left Samos and traveled to Babylon where he became not only King Lycurgus' financial administrator but also the adoptive father of a young man, to whom he conveyed wisdom (101). In time the young man underwent a change of character for the worse and falsely implicated Aesop in a plot against King Lycurgus. The King ordered Aesop put to death, but the person responsible for carrying out the order was a friend and hid Aesop (103–104). Soon thereafter King Lycurgus received a letter from King Nectanabo of Egypt, who challenged Lycurgus to send someone to him who could build a palace between earth and heaven and answer any question he asked. Should the person sent be successful, Nectanabo promised to pay three years of tribute. Aesop was brought out of hiding and convinced the king that he had not plotted against him. The adoptive son was turned over to Aesop, received a stern lecture full of wise sayings and became so upset that he starved himself to death (105–110). Aesop then went to Egypt, overwhelmed Nectanabo with his cleverness and returned to Babylon, bringing the promised tribute. Lycurgus responded by holding a great celebration in Aesop's honor and by erecting a golden statue of him together with the Muses (111–123).

Similarities between this segment of the *Life of Aesop* and the story of Ahiqar are striking. Both were wise persons, who became advisors to an Eastern king. Each adopted a son who turned against his adoptive father. Both were sentenced to die and ended up in hiding. Both went to Egypt and both returned with a considerable sum of money. There are, of course,

(*testimonia*), and for discussion, see Perry, *Babrius and Phaedrus*, Loeb ed. (Cambridge MA: Harvard 1965) pp. xxxv–xlvi.

¹⁵⁶ The segment in question concerns Aesop and the Kings of Babylon and Egypt (101–124). It falls between a segment concerning Aesop, the Samians and Croesus and another segment reporting Aesop's fate at Delphi. The segment in question is only loosely tied to what precedes (we are told that Aesop decided to travel abroad [101]) and to what follows (we read that Aesop wished to go to Delphi [124]). Indeed, the segment in the middle may be said to interrupt the flow of the larger story. For the Samian portion ends with Apollo angered at Aesop for failing to honor him with a statue (100), and that anger ties the Samian segment to the Delphic segment in which we are told that the people of Delphi, who wanted to kill Aesop for disparaging them, devised a plot which they were able to carry out with the connivance of Apollo, who was angry with Aesop for his failure to set up a statue of him in Samos (127).

¹⁵⁷ For the Greek text of the *Life* as transmitted in a tenth century manuscript in the Pierpont Morgan Library (nr. 397), see Perry, *Aesopica* pp. 35–77, and for an English translation, see L. Daly, *Aesop without Morals* (New York: Yoseloff 1961) pp. 31–90.

differences. E.g., in the *Life of Aesop*, the story of Aesop's relationship with his adoptive son is rearranged, so that the overall emphasis in the *Life* is on matters political and not familial as in the story of Ahiqar. In addition, the wise sayings that accompany the two stories exhibit cultural difference: Greek replaces Eastern.¹⁵⁸ Of some interest is the very first piece of wisdom addressed by Aesop to his adoptive son, after the latter had been turned over to Aesop: it is only two words long, θεόν σέβου, "Reverence the god" (109). Kurke p. 181 compares the collection of *Directives of the Seven Sages* attributed to Sosiades by Stobaeus.¹⁵⁹ There pride of place is held by a closely related saying: ἔπου θεῶ, "Follow god" (3.1.173 [vol. 3 p. 125.5 Hense]). I am reminded of a different text also preserved by Stobaeus. It is attributed to Theophrastus and offers a string of directives, the first of which tells us that the man who is going to be admired for his relationship to the divinity must sacrifice frequently (3.3.42 [vol. 3 p. 207.17–208.2] = 523.1–3). Once again the divinity enjoys pride of place. That is not surprising: for the Greeks it is a normal expression of piety, which manifests itself in paraenetic literature, i.e., literature in which a series of precepts are presented succinctly with view to virtuous living.¹⁶⁰

Although no Theophrastean text names Aesop, we can be certain that Theophrastus was well-acquainted with sayings and fables attributed to Aesop. According to Diogenes Laertius, Theophrastus' pupil Demetrius of Phalerum compiled an Αἰσωπέων λόγων συναγωγή (5.80 and 81= fr. 1.63 and 108 Stork et al.). It is natural to translate "Aesopic fables," but the noun λόγοι may be used inclusively, so that the title covers not only fables but also proverbs, clever sayings generally and anecdotes. Perhaps Theophrastus made his own collection of Aesopic materials. Perhaps he took note of Aesop in the works *On Wise Men* and *On Proverbs* (727 no. 12 and 14). That said, it is well to underline that these possibilities do not tell us what Theophrastus included in the work entitled Ἀντίχαρας. No fragment survives, and aside from Diogenes Laertius no later source refers to the work, let alone describe its contents. We can imagine Theophrastus relating the story of Ahiqar and his sayings, either integrating the sayings into the story or relating them independently. If Theophrastus commented on the story, we can imagine

¹⁵⁸ See Kurke pp. 181–183.

¹⁵⁹ On the collection attributed to Sosiades, see Chapter IV, the introduction to Section 2 "Proverbs" pp. 206–207.

¹⁶⁰ For further discussion, see *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) pp. 524–530, where comparison is made with (pseudo-?) Isocrates' address to Demonicus. The paraenetic portion begins with the injunction to be pious in regard to matters concerning the gods (13).

him pointing out the importance of the *καίρος* or critical moment: in the circumstances killing a slave to save the life of Ahiqar was the right choice.¹⁶¹ In addition, we might guess that Theophrastus related Ahiqar to Aesop, describing the two as wise advisors in both private and public life. But the ice is getting thinner; I go no further.

- no. 14 *On Proverbs*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.45 = 1.148; Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.21.12 (vol. 3 p. 558.15 Hense) = 738.2; Harpocration, *Lexicon*, on “*archê andra deiknusi*” (vol. 1 p. 61.2 Dindorf) = 737.3

Literature: Dindorf (1853) vol. 2 p. 116; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; Rupprecht (1949) col. 1739; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 3 p. 68; Kindstrand (1978) p. 75; Sollenberger (1984) pp. 280–281; Wilsdorf (1991) p. 203; Wehrli-Wöhrlé (2004) p. 539

The title *Περὶ παροιμιῶν α'*, *On Proverbs*, 1 book, occurs not only in the first list of Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings (5.45 = 1.148) but also in Stobaeus' *Anthology*, where we read *Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ Περὶ παροιμιῶν*, “Theophrastus in the (work) *On Proverbs*” (3.21.12 = 738). In Harpocration's *Lexicon*, the manuscript reading is faulty: *ἐν τῷ παροιμιῶν*. Here it seems certain that *Περὶ* has fallen out between *τῷ* (dative singular) and *παροιμιῶν* (genitive plural), so that we have still another text that refers to *On Proverbs* (vol. 1 p. 6.12 Dindorf = 737.3).¹⁶² No other text refers to *On Proverbs*, and no text refers to the work by a different title, e.g., *Παροιμίαι*, *Proverbs simpliciter* (no preposition), which would be in line with the Aristotelian title

¹⁶¹ Theophrastus' interest in the *καίρος* is well-known. He wrote works entitled *Politics Regarding Crises* (Diogenes Laertius 5.45 = 1.144 = 589 no. 4a), *On Crises* (5.50 = 1.279 = 589 no. 5) and *Crises* (Suda s.v. ἀρχὴ Σκυρία = 589 no. 6). Concerning the story of Ahiqar, see Wilsdorf p. 201.

¹⁶² In Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Theophrastean writings, titles of one word in the genitive case are not uncommon. Among the titles listed under “Miscellaneous Items-” (pp. 584–589 FHS&G), there are three: *Ἀχροάσεως α'β'*, *Δειλινῶν α'β'* and *Ἐπιστολῶν α'–γ'* (727 no. 1, 2 and 15). In these cases the genitive is to be taken closely with the book number: hence, 2 books or rolls of *Lectures*, 2 books of *Afternoon* (*Discussions*) and 3 books of *Letters*. (For completeness' sake, add the two-word title *Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς*, which occurs twice, followed by *α'–β'* and by *α'* [727 no. 3a and b].) In the text of Harpocration, we have only the phrase *ἐν τῷ παροιμιῶν*. There are no book numbers. Given that two other texts attest to the title *Περὶ παροιμιῶν*, that no other text attests to a Theophrastean work entitled *Παροιμίαι* and that a genitive following immediately on an article in the dative case is awkward, adding *Περὶ* after the dative *τῷ* and before *παροιμιῶν* seems quite sensible and in my judgment correct. Rose and West agree (see the *apparatus criticus* to 737). In his edition of Harpocration (1991), Keaney neither supplies *Περὶ* nor does he consider the possibility (he has no critical apparatus to the text, presumably because he thinks that Rose and West are patently wrong).

as recorded by Diogenes Laertius (5.26). For brief discussion of the Aristotelian work, I refer to Chapter IV “The Texts,” the introduction to section 2 on “Proverbs,” below pp. 196–197. On the Theophrastean texts 737 and 738, see Chapter IV pp. 211–220.¹⁶³

Clearchus, Theophrastus’ contemporary and fellow Peripatetic, also wrote a work on proverbs, to which Athenaeus refers five times using the phrase ἐν τοῖς Περὶ παροιμιῶν, “in the (books) *On Proverbs*” (4.51 160C = fr. 83 Wehrli, 7.23 285C = fr. 81, 8.17 337A = fr. 78, 8.40 347F = fr. 80 and 13.2 555C = fr. 73). Athenaeus also refers to the first book, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ παροιμιῶν (10.86 457C = fr. 63.I), the second book, ἐν δευτέρῳ Περὶ παροιμιῶν (7.102 317A = fr. 75)¹⁶⁴ and the former or earlier book, ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ Περὶ παροιμιῶν (15.62 701C = fr. 64). Of these three references, the second tells us that the work was at least two books long and the last implies that it was only two books long. The repetition of the phrase Περὶ παροιμιῶν in Athenaeus’ references to Clearchus’ work suggests that Athenaeus accepted it as Clearchus’ title or at least the standard way to refer to the Clearchan work. Hence I have written Περὶ (an upper case pi), thereby indicating that the preposition is the first word of the title. That would be in line with the Theophrastean title as printed by Diogenes in his catalogue of Theophrastean titles. It should, however, be noted that Wehrli’s collection contains two Clearchan texts that refer simply to *Proverbs*. One is found among the old scholia on Theocritus’ *Idyls*: ἐν δευτέρῳ τῶν Παροιμιῶν (on V 21/22a p. 161.15–16 Wendel = fr. 66a).¹⁶⁵ The other occurs in Apostolius’ *Collection of Proverbs*: ἐν δευτέρῳ Παροιμιῶν (cent. 13.34 vol. 2 p. 582.4 Leutsch = fr. 66c).¹⁶⁶ Both report a shorter title, which is line with the Aristotelian title Παροιμίαι (Diogenes Laertius 5.26).¹⁶⁷ The scholium is of special interest, for the old scholia on Theocritus are thought to derive from a composite commentary that was largely based on two early works, one belonging to the Augustan period and the other to the

¹⁶³ Plato seems not to have written a work on proverbs or discussed them in detail as part of a larger work/dialogue, but he made noticeable use of proverbs. See below, the introduction to Chapter IV section 2 p. 196.

¹⁶⁴ A scholium on Theocritus also refers to the second book (sch. vet. V 21/22a), as does Apostolius, *Collection of Proverbs* (cent. 13.34). On the title cited by these sources, see below.

¹⁶⁵ The old scholia are to be distinguished from the Byzantine scholia, which are of little value in that they are based on works that have survived. See Dickey p. 64.

¹⁶⁶ Clearchus fr. 66a–c W are focused on the proverb Οὐδὲν ἱερὸν, “Nothing divine,” which is used in regard to things of no value. Fr. 66b refers to Clearchus but does not refer to a particular work.

¹⁶⁷ The fact that the definite article τῶν occurs in the scholium and not in Apostolius seems unimportant.

second century AD.¹⁶⁸ That may cause hesitation concerning the Clearchan title, but scholia are subject to abbreviation (in the course of transmission *Περὶ* might be omitted as superfluous or simply fall out) and the *Collection* of Apostolius counts for little. It is late, derivative and has not been cited in the text-translation volumes.¹⁶⁹ I am, therefore inclined to take my cue from Athenaeus and to accept *Περὶ παροιμιῶν* as the Clearchan title.¹⁷⁰ But I also want to be clear that counting the number of occurrences (*Περὶ παροιμιῶν* occurs eight times in Athenaeus) cannot decide with certainty what Clearchus may have called his work, let alone whether it was already customary for the early Peripatetics to assign titles to their works.¹⁷¹ What we can say is that the source texts printed by Wehrli strongly suggest that the Clearchan work was not a mere collection of proverbs. It also offered explanations, took note of metaphor and saw a connection with riddles.¹⁷²

A commentary focused on Theophrastus is not the place to offer a detailed survey of all the Clearchan fragments (63–83) printed by Wehrli under the heading “Sprichwörter und Ähnliches: Παροιμίαι.” But it is not out of place to call attention to two Clearchan texts that mention or at least are closely connected with Theophrastus. One is fr. 69c, in which both Clearchus and Theophrastus are named in regard to the proverb “Know yourself.” See below Chapter IV “The Texts” p. 216 on 738. The other is fr. 80, which mentions Clearchus in relation to the proverb “No bad fish is large.” Immediately thereafter Theophrastus is named in regard to the same proverb, albeit slightly altered. See below, Chapter IV pp. 225–227 on 710.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁸ See Dickey pp. 63–65.

¹⁶⁹ Apostolius, whose floruit belongs to the middle of the fifteenth century, was excluded from the text-translation volumes in accordance with our statement of “Methodology” on page 5 of volume 1.

¹⁷⁰ See Dorandi (2006) p. 157, citing W. Bühler, *Zenobii Athoi Proverbia vulgari ceteraque memoria aucta* V (Gottingae 1999) p. 190; also Dorandi (2011) pp. 12–13. In addition to the eight Athenaeian texts printed by Wehrli, the second century AD papyrus PSI 1903 = fr. 69d W might be cited to support the title *Περὶ παροιμιῶν*. But the text is lacunose, so that the reading involves conjecture: Κλέ[αρχος δ' ἐν το]ῖς *Περὶ* [παροιμ]ῶν. One might prefer to restore the text, so that the Clearchan work referred to is *Περὶ βίων*. See Dorandi (2006) p. 162 and 168.

¹⁷¹ Concerning the assignation of titles in the early Peripatos, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 126–127.

¹⁷² See also the introduction to Section 2 of Chapter IV on “Proverbs” pp. 203–204.

¹⁷³ Concerning the remains of a stele found in Kahnum, which listed sayings and whose base names Clearchus, see Ch IV sec 2 intro pp. 206–207.

- no. 15 *Letters*, three books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.46 = 1.192; Photius, *Library* 190 148b20 (*CB* vol. 3 p. 57.27 Henry) = 588.3
- no. 16 *Letters to Astycreon, Phantias*,¹⁷⁴ *Nicanor*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.50 = 1.276 a–b *Letter to Phantias*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.37 = 1.17–18; Scholium on Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* 1.972 (p. 85.12–13 Wendel) = 374.2–3

Literature: Usener (1858) p. 16; Weinreich (1933) p. 11; Laqueur (1938) col. 1565; Brink (1940) col. 922; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1359, 1535, 1540–1541; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 9 p. 27; Sollenberger (1984) p. 309, 367–368; Sharples (1995) pp. 104–105; Engels (1998) pp. 291–292; Squillace (2012) pp. 103–120, 166–169; Fortenbaugh (2015) ch. 2

Two titles are listed above, and both concern collections of letters written by Theophrastus.¹⁷⁵ The first, no. 15, is the shorter: Ἐπιστολῶν α'β'γ', *Letters*, 3 books. If the book numbers are ignored, the title is limited to a single word. It occurs in the second list of Diogenes catalogue, which is arranged alphabetically. The second title, no. 16a, is the longer: Ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀστυκρέοντι, Φανίᾳ, Νικάνορι, *Letters to Astycreon, Phantias, Nicanor*.¹⁷⁶ No book numbers

¹⁷⁴ In the text-translation volumes, we wrote “Phantias.” That is the Attic form of the proper noun. On Lesbos the name would have been written with an iota “Phainias.” Since both Theophrastus and Phantias hailed from Eresus on Lesbos, Theophrastus may well have used “Phainias” in addressing his fellow countryman. However, Theophrastus was credited with speaking good Attic Greek (7A–B) and may have preferred the Attic form. Be that as it may, in this commentary I shall follow the text-translation volumes and write “Phantias.”

¹⁷⁵ Letters written by other members of the Peripatos are attested for Aristotle (fr. 651–670 Rose³), Dicaearchus (fr. 1.4 = 11B.2 Mirhady), Demetrius of Phalerum (fr. 1.104 = 149 Stork et al.), Strato (fr. 1.57 Sharples) and Hieronymus of Rhodes (fr. 30 White). In regard to Hieronymus, the relevant text is ambiguous (Regenbogen col. 1540–1541) and might be read as citing a collection of letters written by Theophrastus (see Wehrli [1967–1978] vol. 10 p. 40). But that is most likely wrong. The flow of the Greek sentence (fr. 30. 7–8 W = 578.3–4 FHS&G) and the immediately preceding references speak for attributing the collection to Hieronymus. For brief discussion, see *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics pp. 732–733.

¹⁷⁶ Sollenberger p. 368 comments that the use of the preposition ἐπὶ to refer to the addressee of a letter is unusual; one would expect πρὸς. Since there is no manuscript authority for emending the text to read πρὸς, and since changing ἐπὶ to πρὸς would require changing the three proper nouns to the accusative case, Sollenberger prefers not to emend. Regenbogen proposes a minimal emendation: expanding ἐπὶ to read ἐπι(γραφόμεναι). In support of Regenbogen's proposal, one might cite Polybius, *Histories* 16.36.4 and Plutarch, *Life of Cicero* 15.2 (both listed by LSJ s.v. ἐπιγράφω II.1), where the perfect passive participle occurs. If one were to make the change in 16a, the perfect seems preferable to the present. For completeness' sake, I note that the dative is common in salutations at the head of an individual letter (e.g., 518) and in this way may appear in the title of a collection (e.g., at the end of Diogenes' catalogue of writings by Strato of Lampsacus, there occurs Ἐπιστολαὶ ὧν ἀρχή· Στράτων Ἀρσινόῃ εὖ πράττειν [5.60 = 1.57–58 Sharples]).

are given. The title occurs in the fifth list of Diogenes' catalogue, which is like the second in being arranged alphabetically.¹⁷⁷ Under 16a we have printed 16b, ἡ πρὸς Φανίαν ἐπιστολή, *Letter to Phantias*. It is like 16a in that it mentions an addressee, but only one, Phantias. It is not found in Diogenes' catalogue but rather earlier in the biography proper (1.17–18) and in a scholium on the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius (374.2–3), where it occurs without book number. In the biography, we read ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φανίαν τὸν Περιπατητικὸν ἐπιστολῇ. In the scholium, the same phrase occurs without τὸν Περιπατητικόν. As I now understand the phrase, it refers to a particular letter/epistle written by Theophrastus to Phantias. Nothing suggests that the title of a book or collection is being reported. If that is correct, then we erred in italicizing the translation of 16b, i.e., in printing *Letter to Phantias*, for italics indicate a title.¹⁷⁸ In any second edition of the text-translation volumes, either the translation should not be printed in italics¹⁷⁹ or 16b should be eliminated, 16a should become 16, and “cf. 1.17–18 et/and 374.2–3” should be added to 16. I prefer the latter.

In the text-translation volumes, 588 is printed last in the section on “Religion.” It is listed (mentioned but not printed) in the section on “Miscellaneous Items” as a second witness to title no. 15 Ἐπιστολῶν α'β'γ'. The text is taken from the *Library* of Photius (c. 810–895 AD)¹⁸⁰ and in particular from a résumé of what Photius had read in the *New History* of Ptolemy Chennus (1st–2nd century AD),¹⁸¹ The excerpt runs as follows:

¹⁷⁷ Title no. 16a is found among those titles whose significant word begins with epsilon. More precisely it comes first, being followed by Περὶ εὐσεβείας, *On Piety*, on which see below, the introduction to Chapter IV “The Texts” pp. 136–142. The fifth list contains certain titles that some scholars deem spurious (i.e., *Astronomical Research* and *Arithmetical Researches concerning Increase* [1.271–272 = 137 no. 43 and 264 no. 2]), but that is not good reason to doubt 16a.

¹⁷⁸ In no. 15 and 16a, a collection is being referred to by title and that is signaled by the upper case epsilon and plural case ending: Ἐπιστολῶν α'β'γ' and Ἐπιστολαί. Of course, these titles may postdate Theophrastus. A latter editor or collector may have assigned the titles without any thought of attributing them to Theophrastus. But that is a different issue. See the literature cited below, p. 143 n. 23.

¹⁷⁹ Using italics in the translation of 16b is oddly inconsistent with the Greek as printed in 16b: ἡ πρὸς Φανίαν ἐπιστολή. Since in English italics signal a title, one might expect that the initial eta would be printed in upper case, for that would signal a title. But it occurs (correctly) in lower case.

¹⁸⁰ Of special importance for Theophrastean studies is Photius' *Library* 278 (525a30–529b23), which draws on nine of Theophrastus' scientific *opuscula*. For brief remarks on Photius, see *Commentary* 6.1 pp. 111–112.

¹⁸¹ On Ptolemy Chennus, see A. Dihle, “Ptolemy 77” in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 23.2 (1959) col. 1862, who cites A. Hartmann, *Untersuchungen über die Sagen vom Tode des Odysseus* (München 1917) p. 146 ff. regarding the unreliability of Ptolemy.

καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ θεοσεβείᾳ πάντων διενεγκεῖν οἱ μὲν Ἀντίγονον τὸν Ἐφέσιον, οἱ δὲ Λυκίαν τὸν Ἑρμιονέα, οὗ καὶ Θεόφραστος ἐν Ἐπιστολαῖς μνημονεύει,

And some (say) that Antigonos of Ephesus surpassed everyone in religiosity, but others say it was Lycias of Hermione, of whom Theophrastus makes mention in his letters.¹⁸²

The primary discussion of this text will be found in *Commentary* 6.2 on religion by Stefan Schorn. Our special concern is the phrase ἐν Ἐπιστολαῖς. The use of an upper case epsilon indicates a book title, and that title agrees with title no. 15 as it occurs in Diogenes' catalogue. Without the preposition ἐν (588) and without the book numbers (Diog.), both texts have Ἐπιστολαί. There are, however, two problems. The first is trivial: our translation does not reflect the Greek text as printed in 588. Instead of *Letters*, capital L and italics, which would indicate a book title, the translation reads "letters," lower case and no italics. That is inconsistent but also easily remedied by changing our translation to "*Letters*." The second problem is presented by Henry's Budé text, which is printed in the section on "Religion" and reprinted above for easy consideration. I am thinking of the final phrase, οὗ καὶ Θεόφραστος ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς μνημονεύει, which Henry translates, "dont Théophraste parle dans des lettres." Apparently Henry does not recognize a title in the Greek text. His translation refers vaguely to some letters, which need not have been collected into three books or rolls that together made up a work entitled *Letters*. I see no way to decide with certainty how the Greek text is best printed and translated, though I am inclined to follow Henry.

To complicate matters, it should be acknowledged that Lycias could have been mentioned in a letter to Astycreon or Phantias or Nicanor. And were that the case, then text 588 should appear as a second attestation to title 16a, albeit in shortened form (the addressees omitted).

To complicate the matter still further, I mention that Usener wanted to identify the *Letters to Astycreon, Phantias, Nicanor* with the *Letters* in three books. The identification cannot be ruled out. But if we go down that path, we might better think of overlap rather than identity: the *Letters to Astycreon, Phantias, Nicanor* might have been a part and not the whole of the three books of *Letters*. Certainly Astycreon, Phantias and Nicanor were not the only persons to whom Theophrastus wrote—we read of correspondence with Eudemus of Rhodes (Simplicius, *On Aristotle's Physics* 6, introduction

¹⁸² Both Antigonos and Lycias are otherwise unknown. So Henry in the Budé edition p. 57 n. 6 and 7. From the context it seems clear that Theophrastus will have referred to Lycias as an especially religious person.

[CAG vol. 10 p. 923.7–17] = 157)—so that some or much of the correspondence with other people like Eudemus could have been included in a collection that ran for three books. Given the uncertainties, it seems best to continue listing no. 15 and no. 16 as separate works.

No text other than Diogenes' catalogue makes explicit reference to a letter or letters written by Theophrastus either to Astycreon or to Nicanor. Who the former might be is not clear. One possibility is provided by Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 7.33. There on the authority of the historian Hegesander (2nd century BC)¹⁸³ we are told that a certain Astycreon was cured of disease by a Syracusan doctor named Menecrates.¹⁸⁴ The doctor was known for his self-importance: he called himself Zeus and made the patients whom he cured serve him as slaves. Astycreon is said to have been one of those patients and to have received the name Apollo (289A–C).¹⁸⁵ Chronologically this Astycreon could be the addressee of a letter or letters written by Theophrastus. For the doctor who is said to have cured Astycreon, i.e., Menecrates, is mentioned by Alexis, the poet of Middle Comedy and the uncle of Menander, in the *Minos* (fr. 136 CAF vol. 2 p. 346 Kock = fr. 156 PCG vol. 2 p. 110 Kassel-Austin). Moreover, several sources tell us that Theophrastus was interested in remarkable cures,¹⁸⁶ and we can imagine Theophrastus corresponding with Astycreon about his cure and subsequent slavery.

In a monograph entitled *Menecrate di Siracua*, Giuseppe Squillace accepts the idea that the addressee in question could be the Astycreon, who is reported to have been cured by the doctor Menecrates.¹⁸⁷ He develops the idea pointing out that in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings Astycreon is mentioned together with Phantias and Nicanor, who were

¹⁸³ Hegesander of Delphi wrote Ὑπομνήματα, *Memoranda* (Athenaeus 6.53 248E). See Weinreich pp. 99–100, who holds that Athenaeus used Hegesander directly.

¹⁸⁴ FHG vol. 4 p. 414. In Weinreich the text is found in Beilage 1 p. 99 and in Squillace the text is T 1 p. 104.

¹⁸⁵ The reading Ἀστυκρέοντα at Athenaeus 7.33 289C is that of the primary manuscript (codex A = Venetus Marcianus 447 dating from the late 9th or early 10th century). Two manuscripts of the epitome (codices C and E) exhibit Ἀστυκλέα. I follow Schweighauser, Kaibel, Gulick and Olson in accepting the reading of the primary manuscript.

¹⁸⁶ Apollonius, *Amazing Stories* 49.1–3, Athenaeus 14.18 624A–B, and Gellius, *Attic Nights* 4.13.1–2 = 726A–C, respectively. In cod. Laurentius 73.1 = new entry 66 no. 1.5 (see the Addenda p. 295), both Theophrastus and Menecrates (the cod. reads “Menegrates” but the correction seems certain) are named in a list of medical writers, but in itself that does not establish a connection between Theophrastus and Menecrates, either direct or indirect through Astycreon.

¹⁸⁷ Squillace pp. 167–169 acknowledges repeatedly that he is presenting a possibility.

members of the Peripatos. That suggests that Astycreon, too, was a member of the Peripatos, with whom Theophrastus corresponded by letter. At some unspecified time, Astycreon became sick and was cured by Menecrates. The treatment and cure were recorded by Dicaearchus, a contemporary Peripatetic, who had a keen interest in physiology and disease. Hegesander, who drew on Dicaearchus for a report concerning the kottabus,¹⁸⁸ did the same in regard to Menecrates and Astycreon. Subsequently Athenaeus drew on Hegesander for his account of the disease and cure. There is nothing impossible here, but introducing Dicaearchus as Hegesander's source needs additional support.¹⁸⁹

A further consideration is provided by the alleged exchange of letters between the Menecrates and Philip of Macedon. According to Athenaeus, Menecrates wrote Philip, depicting himself as more important than the Macedonian. The latter responded with a salutation that constituted a one-word put-down. Instead of χαίρειν, “be joyful” or simply “greetings” (so Menecrates to Philip),¹⁹⁰ Philip replied with ὑγιαίνειν, “be well,” understood as “be sane” (7 289D). The playfulness is clever and found elsewhere. I am thinking of Plutarch's *Life of Agesilaus*, in which the Spartan king is made to reply in an identical manner to Menecrates (21.5).¹⁹¹ Apparently the interaction between the king and the doctor involved movable material that could be repeated in anecdotes and even find its way into fabricated letters.¹⁹² That does not prove that the letters of Philip and Agesilaus to Menecrates were fabrications (or one of the letters was), but it does raise the issue and makes clear that Menecrates was the sort of person who might excite witty fabrication. That said, it is important to distinguish clearly between letters addressed to a mad doctor who is reputed to have cured a patient named Astycreon and one or more letters by Theophrastus to an Astycreon who is named alongside two reputable Peripatetics. The letters to Phanias and

¹⁸⁸ Athenaeus 11.58 479D–E = Dicaearchus fr. 97 = fr. 109 Mirhady.

¹⁸⁹ Squillace mentions Dicaearchus' interest in medical matters, which he supports by referring to several works of Dicaearchus: *On Soul*, *On Human Destruction*, *Life of Greece* (fr. 11–12e, 24, 47–66 Wehrli = fr. 21A–B, 22, 78, 53–77 Mirhady) and by his explanation of “Heracleian disease” (fr. 101 W = 68 M).

¹⁹⁰ The infinitive χαίρειν is a standard salutation in letters. See LSJ III.1.c.

¹⁹¹ Since Plutarch is the earlier author, it might be thought that Athenaeus is drawing on Plutarch. But the letter in Athenaeus is fuller. There may have been an earlier source, on which both drew, or maybe Athenaeus filled out the letter on his own.

¹⁹² For an example of a fabricated letter in which Theophrastus is mentioned, see the letter of pseudo-Aristotle to Philip (*Letters* 4.1–5 [BT p. 31.7–32.2 Plezia] = 518), with *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) pp. 509–511.

Nicanor will have been genuine letters that were preserved in the School and in all likelihood the same is true of any letters written by Theophrastus to Astycreon.

In regard to Nicanor, we know that he was Aristotle's nephew and that in his will Aristotle arranged for his daughter to be given in marriage to Nicanor. He also provided that should anything happen to Nicanor, then Theophrastus, if he wishes, may live with the daughter (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5. 12–13). That suggests that correspondence between Theophrastus and Nicanor will have included personal matters, but it hardly excludes other topics.¹⁹³

In regard to Phantias—an Eresian like Theophrastus and a member of the Peripatos as well—our sources are somewhat better: two additional texts make explicit mention of letters written by Theophrastus to Phantias. One is found early in Diogenes' *Life of Theophrastus* and concerns teaching in the School (5.37 = 1.16–21). The text runs as follows:

οὗτος τὰ τ' ἄλλα καὶ περὶ δεικτηρίου τοιαῦτα διείλεκται ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φανίαν τὸν Περιπατητικὸν ἐπιστολῇ: “οὐ γὰρ ὅτι πανήγυριν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ συνέδριον ῥάδιον, οἶόν τις βούλεται, λαβεῖν. αἱ δὲ ἀναγνώσεις ποιοῦσιν ἐπανορθώσεις. τὸ δὲ ἀναβάλλεσθαι πάντα καὶ ἀμελεῖν οὐκέτι φέρουσιν αἱ ἡλικίαι.” ἐν ταύτῃ ἐπιστολῇ “σχολαστικὸν”¹⁹⁴ ὠνόμακεν.

In the letter to Phantias the Peripatetic, he (Theophrastus) discussed, among other things, matters concerning the lecture-hall as follows: “For not only is it not easy to get a public assembly, but not even a small company of listeners such as one would like. Readings of one's work lead to corrections. The present generation no longer tolerates the deferring of everything and lack of care.” In this letter, he used the term “scholastic.”

The words quoted by Diogenes are brief and leave us guessing what prompted Theophrastus to express himself in such a negative manner. We can imagine that Phantias had written urging Theophrastus to take care of his health by teaching less. Perhaps the letter dates from c. 290 BC, when Theophrastus

¹⁹³ Nicanor involved himself in political matters (e.g., at the Olympic games in 324 BC he had the herald read Alexander's decree that Greek exiles should return to their native cities); ultimately he came into conflict with Cassander, was condemned and executed (Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History* 18.8.3–4, 75.1). Caveat: the nephew of Aristotle, is not to be confused with the garrison commander of Munychia, who was installed in that post by Cassander. See A. Bosworth, “A New Macedonian Prince,” *Classical Quarterly* 44 (1994) pp. 57–65 and W. Heckel “Nicanor of Balacrus,” *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 47 (2007) p. 402.

¹⁹⁴ Ménage wanted to read σχολαστικὸν (αὐτόν), so that Theophrastus will have used σχολαστικὸν to describe himself (cf. Regenbogen col. 1359). But there is no manuscript support for inserting αὐτόν. (See the critical apparatus to 1.21 in vol. 1 p. 23 FHS&G.) The text is best left as transmitted. See Sollenberger pp. 172–176, 450.

was already in his late seventies or early eighties. But such a late date runs up against the question whether Phanias was still alive.¹⁹⁵ In addition, it is by no means clear that Theophrastus' remarks were in response to something written by Phanias. Theophrastus himself may have initiated the complaint concerning his lectures within the School. Age and health may have played a role, but it is also possible that Theophrastus had become tired of making corrections to the notes and treatises from which he lectured.¹⁹⁶ We need not think of a permanent disaffection. A limited period might better suit a scholar who will have recognized the benefit in readings that lead to corrections. Such an explanation is possible, perhaps even probably, so that I am inclined to believe that the excerpt is drawn from a genuine letter, which was preserved in the School as part of a larger collection of letters (no. 16). That said, it should be recognized that the preceding considerations do not demonstrate the authenticity of the letter in question. It remains possible that we are dealing with a fabrication, which depends on the idea of common citizenship: one citizen of Eresus feels free to express himself openly to a fellow Eresian.

The second additional text is found in a scholium on the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes (1.972 p. 85 Wendel = 374). It runs as follows:

λέγεται δὲ ἰουλος καὶ ζῶν τι, θηρίδιον πολὺπουν· ἐκατέρωθεν γὰρ ἔχει πολλοὺς πόδας ὥσπερ ἡ σκολόπενδρα. Θεόφραστος δὲ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φανίαν ἐπιστολῇ καὶ ὄνον φησὶν αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι, ὡς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Κωφοῖς Σατύροις· “κυλισθεὶς ὡς τις ὄνος ἰσόσπιρος.”

Ioulos is also the name of a living thing, a little creature with many legs (the wood-louse); for it has many legs on each side, like the millipede. Theophrastus in his letter to Phainias says that it is also called *onos* (“ass”), as in Sophocles' *Dumb Satyrs*: “rolled up like some *onos* like a bean.”

¹⁹⁵ The year of Phanias' death is uncertain and various proposals have been made: e.g., between 317 and 307 BC (Engels p. 290) and c. 300 BC (H. Gottschalk, “Phaenias” in *Brill's New Pauly* 10 [2007] p. 902). In my judgment it is better to recognize that the date cannot be fixed with any certainty.

¹⁹⁶ The idea that notes and treatises (i.e., esoteric works, on which see *Commentary* 6.1 [2011] pp. 127–130) were the basis of lectures in the early Peripatos is common. For a suggestive passage that is occasionally overlooked, see Plutarch, *Whether an Old Man Should Engage in Public Affairs* 26 796D: τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ δίφρου διαλεγομένους καὶ σχολὰς ἐπὶ βιβλίοις περαίνοντας, “those who discourse from a chair and prepare/write lectures in books.” The text has been discussed in connection with Dicaearchus fr. 43 Mirhady; see, e.g., Wehrli (1967–1978) p. 51 and S. White, “Principes Sapientiae,” in *Dicaearchus of Messana*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (New Brunswick: Transaction 2001) = Rutgers Studies in Classical Humanities in Classical Humanities 10 p. 214.

The Theophrastean material conveyed in this text is no more than a single sentence involving indirect discourse and a few words drawn from a Sophoclean satyr play (*TrGF* vol. 4 p. 327 fr. 363 Radt.). There is no reason to suspect fabrication, unless one imagines a potential readership that was fascinated by little creatures with numerous legs. Both Aristotle and Theophrastus took note of the wood-louse in their scientific writings (*Research on Animals* 5.31 557a23 and *Research on Plants* 4.3.6, respectively) and Theophrastus shared his interest with Phantias. Whether Phantias was himself interested in many legged creatures and Theophrastus was responding to a question put by him is not said. Nor is it said that Theophrastus unprompted wanted to share with his fellow countryman a piece of information that interested him.

I end with a word of caution. Two letters and what little we know about the content of these letters tell us little concerning interaction between Theophrastus and Phantias. We can say that the two were on occasion separated and for that reason corresponded by letter, but we should not see in two letters evidence that during Theophrastus' headship of the Peripatos, Phantias kept "his distance from the regular daily life of the school."¹⁹⁷ Phantias may well have been present frequently, perhaps lecturing on logic and other topics central to teaching within the Peripatos.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁷ Engels, p. 291.

¹⁹⁸ See "Two Eresians: Phainias and Theophrastus," forthcoming in *Phainias of Eresus: Text, Translation and Comment* = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 19 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2014) ch. 2. On "Phainias" as against "Phantias," see above, n. 174.

IV.

THE TEXTS

1. *Discoveries and Beginnings*

Human beings are naturally interested in “firsts”. Being curious they want to know who were the people who discovered or invented things both useful and pleasurable and more generally who first introduced changes that transformed the way people live. The ancient Greeks were no exception. They were naturally curious concerning firsts and over time developed various accounts of life-changing firsts. In dealing with prehistoric times, for which written records did not exist and oral tradition was at best selective, they created not only a mythology involving gods and heroes but also rational/theoretical accounts that traced man’s progress from a primitive existence to a more comfortable life. They even developed a special genre *περὶ εὐρημάτων*, on discoveries/inventions, which was embraced by the early Peripatetics. See above Chapter III “Titles of Books” no. 11, *On Discoveries*.

In regard to mythology we may think of Hesiod and Aeschylus, who tell how Prometheus provided mankind with intelligence and numerous other benefits including fire. See below on 729. Regarding rational accounts, Thucydides and Plato come to mind. At the very beginning of his *History* of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides presents an “Archaeology” (1.1.1–21.2), in which he discusses advances in man’s circumstances and along the way cites not a few firsts. E.g., the Athenians are said to have been the first to put aside arms and to adopt a more luxurious mode of dress (1.6.3), and the Spartans are said to have been first to adopt an unpretentious costume and to exercise naked (1.6.4–5). The Corinthians are credited with modernizing shipping and in particular with being first to build triremes (1.13.2). At beginning and end of this Archaeology, Thucydides acknowledges that his account involves conjecture, but he insists that he has based his conjectures on the best available evidence (1.1.2, 9.5, 21.1). The account is selective, but that is not a fault, for the account is subordinate to Thucydides primary aim: namely, to make clear that the Peloponnesian War is greater than all previous wars (1.1.1, 21.2). Toward that end he picks and chooses firsts that help his case.

In the *Laws*, Plato sets aside the idealism of the *Republic* and focuses on a second best city-state: one that takes account of human nature and the realities of human community. To develop a clear picture of this city-state, Plato has the Athenian Stranger focus on the πολιτείας ἀρχή or πρώτη τῶν πολιτειῶν γένεσις, the origin or beginning of political arrangement(s) (3 677A, C). The Stranger posits a devastating flood that forces survivors to reinvent a life style that satisfies human needs. We are told not only of a gradual development from single homes to larger communities but also of the arts, e.g., music, weaving and metal work, which have been lost and must be rediscovered. What interests me here is not the initial fantasy, the introduction of a post-deluvian period. It is, rather, the Athenian Stranger's over-riding concern with a second-best city-state. As in Thucydides, so here we proceed through a series of changes that affect human life. And these changes play a subordinate role to the Stranger's overall goal. That is different from a work belonging to the genre περὶ εὐρημάτων. For in such a work the focus is on discoveries *per se*. They do not play a subordinate role and need not be part of or make reference to a developmental account.

The fullest example of Theophrastus' interest in firsts is found not in the fragments of his work *On Discoveries*—they are woefully few—but in the fragments of his work *On Piety*, which are found in Porphyry's work *On Abstinence from Eating Animals*.¹ Thanks to the groundbreaking work of Jacob Bernays, the Theophrastean material excerpted by Porphyry has been largely recovered² and is available today with minor variations in four separate publications.³ We learn that Theophrastus not only criticized animal

¹ In this work, Porphyry aims to persuade Firmus Castrius to give up eating meat and return to a vegetarian diet, which had been his practice at an early time. Toward this end, Porphyry finds it useful to draw on Theophrastus' work *On Piety* (580 no. 3).

² At *On Abstinence from Eating Animals* 2.32.3, Porphyry refers to his preceding remarks on sacrifice (i.e. 2.5.1–32.2) and says, "These are the main points of Theophrastus on why one must not sacrifice animals, apart from interspersed myths and a few things that have been added or shortened by us" (584A.381–383). Although Porphyry has not omitted all myth/legend (the story of Diomus or Sopatros in 2.29–30 seems to be Theophrastean; see below on the Thoes, the Bassarians and Clymene), his statement is to be taken seriously: Porphyry has indeed drawn on Theophrastus and done so with considerable fidelity to his source. That is in line with Porphyry's treatment of other sources. See Bernays pp. 22–28, who investigated Porphyry's use of Josephus' *History of the Jewish War* and determined that Porphyry largely reproduced what Josephus said. Pötscher (1964) pp. 5–14 reached a similar conclusion in regard to Porphyry's use of Plutarch's *On the Intelligence of Animals*. There is no strong reason to think that Porphyry treated Theophrastus any differently.

³ Bernays (1866) pp. 39–93, Pötscher (1964) pp. 146–183; Fortenbaugh (1984) pp. 54–65; Sources (1992) vol. 2 pp. 404–410. A good English translation of Porphyry, *On Abstinence* is that of Clark (2000). The relevant pages are 56–68 (translation) and 144–152 (notes).

sacrifice but also advanced a developmental account of sacrificial practices (Porphry 2.5.1–9.2 = 584A.1–92).⁴ We are told that the earliest sacrifices were simple grasses. After that came the fruits of trees, cultivated grains, wine, honey and oil.⁵ The development ends with human and animal sacrifice, which are condemned. The account is theoretical, even speculative, but it is not foolish. It involves a clear idea of developments prompted by changes in man's situation, both environmental and social/civic. We are told that before trees appeared, men sacrificed grasses to the gods, but when trees appeared, men began to eat the fruit of the oak and to include it in sacrifices (2.5.6 = 24–28). In contrast, blood sacrifice was brought on not only by famine but also by war (2.7.2, 12.1 = 55–57, 96–99).⁶ The effects of discovery and invention are recognized. When men discovered how to use wine, honey and oil, all products of nature, they began offering these to the gods (2.6.4 = 44–46). And when men learned to grind grain, an advance in technology, they considered their life blessed in comparison with what we went before. Accordingly they began offering a portion of ground grain to the gods, a practice which is said to persist to the present day (2.6.2 = 31–35). The importance of the present day—it preserves evidence concerning the past—is not confined to a single instance. In regard to the simplicity of early sacrifices, we are told that one can observe the many persons who still sacrifice cut up pieces of sweet-smelling wood (2.5.5 = 22–24). And to make clear that many different things have come to be included in sacrifices, reference is made to the things that are presently carried in the procession of the Sun and Hours (2.7.1 = 47–51).⁷ Throughout all of this, we hear of firsts: the Egyptians were first to begin sacrificing (2.5.1 = 3); when trees began to grow, men ate the fruit of the

⁴ In 2.5.1–9.2, we have a developmental account in which the stages of development are clearly indicated. In what follows on this account, Theophrastus (as reported/excerpted by Porphry) has much to say about the development, but the fundamentals of the account are not altered, though subsequent remarks occasionally add clarity. See the immediately following note.

⁵ The order wine-honey-oil is the order in which the three items are mentioned within the developmental account (2.6.4 = 584A.44–45). Later the order is altered to reflect the order in which the several liquid offerings are believed to have been introduced into sacrificial practice: honey-oil-wine (2.20.3 = 173–175).

⁶ The idea that war prompted change is repeated later (2.22.1 = 193–194).

⁷ The adverb “presently” translates ἔτι καὶ νῦν (2.7.1 = 47). In the text-translation volumes, we translated “still,” as does Clark p. 57 and 146, who compares 2.26.1 = 261. She allows that Porphry may have thought that the procession still occurred in his day. That is possible, but if we think that Porphry has extracted Theophrastean material with fidelity, then there is little reason to see in ἔτι καὶ νῦν a reference to Porphry's own day. It is a straightforward reference to Theophrastus' time. Cf. καὶ νῦν ἔτι at 2.21.4 = 188, ἀφ' οὗ/ἀπὸ δ' ἐκείνου μέχρι τοῦ νῦν at 2.27.2, 30.4 = 282–283, 355, and νῦν by itself at 2.8.3, 30.5 = 79, 360.

first oak and began to sacrifice it (2.5.6 = 24–28);⁸ barley was first to appear after the legume (2.6.1 = 29); the Bassarians were first to engage in human sacrifice (2.8.3 = 82). But sometimes firsts can be regarded as additions—either improvements or changes for the worse—so that it is not surprising to find explicit reference to additions: myrrh, cassia and frankincense are said to have been added many generations after the Egyptians began sacrificing (2.5.1 = 4.6); cakes of wheat were added after ground barley (2.6.3 = 39–41); the Bessarians added eating the victims of human sacrifice (2.8.3 = 76–78).⁹

An apparent difficulty is that human beings are present at the outset. We hear of the Egyptians, “the most rational race of all,” who are said to have “started first from the beginning to sacrifice to the heavenly gods.” They did not sacrifice myrrh or cassia or frankincense but rather grass, which the earth gave forth much earlier than trees (2.5.1–2 = 584A.1–11). That jars with modern theories of evolution, but it would be a mistake to think that Theophrastus intended the developmental account presented in *On Piety* to be a scientific document and nothing more. The account has been excerpted from Theophrastus’ work *On Piety* (580 no. 3), whose primary orientation was religious and ethical. Theophrastus was opposed to animal sacrifice and found it useful not only to involve human beings from the start but also to assign pride of place to the simplest of sacrifices, i.e., grass. In an environment lacking trees that is appropriate, but it also emphasizes an important truth. Expensive sacrifices are not possible for most people, and even when a person can afford magnificent sacrifices, the condition of his soul, i.e., his motives are more important. Similarly, Theophrastus found it useful to place animal sacrifice at the end of his account, thereby creating a

⁸ A proverb like “Enough of the oak” *qua* relic of the past can be viewed both as a part of the present, i.e., a well-known phrase occurring in ordinary discourse, and also as evidence of the prehistoric past. See below, Section 2 p. 201 n. 196 on 2.5.6 = 584A.24–28.

⁹ Furthermore, improvements can result in a significant change such that one speaks of an invention or discovery. See J. Fairweather, “Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers,” *Ancient Society* 5 (1974) pp. 265–266 and S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis: Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel: Schwabe 2004) pp. 260–261. The idea is clearly expressed by Diogenes Laertius, who deems Plato the inventor of the dialogue. Diogenes begins by telling us that people speak of Zeno the Eleatic as the first to write dialogues. After that he refers to Favorinus, who reports that Aristotle says it was Alexamenus of Styra or Teos. Finally Diogenes expresses his own view: Plato, who perfected the form of the dialogue, ought to carry off the first prize for its invention as well as its beauty (*Lives* 3.48). See below p. 168 on 733 (the painter Polygnotus), pp. 172–173 with n. 111 on 734 (the Corinthian bit) and pp. 173–177 (the potter’s wheel).

devolutionary account, which ends with the corruption of proper practice.¹⁰ First came human sacrifice brought on by famine and war. Animal sacrifice followed: it is said to be “later and most recent” (2.9.1 = 84). It is, as it were, the ultimate degradation that Theophrastus strongly opposed. Hence, we are not surprised that the Theophrastean extracts (all the extracts and not just those extracts that make up the initial developmental account) conclude with two clear assertions of this opposition: “Thus even in ancient times it was not holy to kill those animals that contribute to our lives” (2.31.1 = 366–367) and “These are the main points of Theophrastus on why one must not sacrifice animals” (2.32.3 = 381).¹¹

The developmental account makes explicit mention of certain consequences that followed on the introduction of blood sacrifice. The gods, we are told, made some persons atheists and caused others to think that the gods are worthless. Some gave up sacrificing altogether, while others engaged in illegal sacrifice. Named are the Thoes, who performed no sacrifices and the Bassarians. The former were destroyed without trace, while the latter took to sacrificing and eating humans, until the family that had begun this practice was destroyed (2.8.1–3 = 65–83). We also hear of an Athenian woman named Clymene, who is said to have killed a swine accidentally. Being troubled, her husband consulted the oracle at Pytho,¹² and when the god did not object, the killing was deemed a matter of indifference (2.9.2 = 92).¹³ We are to understand that the Athenians henceforth viewed

¹⁰ Cf. Clark p. 145, who suggests that Theophrastus may have been influenced by Plato's *Timaeus* 77A, in which “the gods make humans, then plants to feed them; animals develop later from unsatisfactory humans.”

¹¹ The two assertions do not come at the end of the opening developmental account (2.5.1–9.1) but rather considerably later (2.31.1, 32.3). That said, I think it correct to say that the assertions agree with the opening account in viewing animal sacrifice as the ultimate degradation of sacrifice as practiced in Theophrastus' day, when the Greeks in general rejected human sacrifice.

¹² The husband went to Pytho, Πυθώδε (2.9.2 = 90), i.e., to Delphi to consult the oracle of Apollo. See below, the commentary on 582.

¹³ Although Bernays p. 61 denied that the story of Clymene belongs among the Theophrastean extracts, more recent scholars, myself included, accept the story as Theophrastean. Here I limit myself to a single observation concerning the adjective ἀδιάφορον, “indifferent” (584A.92). In Stoic ethical theory, the adjective is important—something that is indifferent is neither good nor bad, but it may be preferred or unpreferred—and the occurrence of the adjective to describe a sacrifice that is morally neutral might be seen as a reason for denying that the story of Clymene is a Theophrastean extract. Nevertheless, in my judgment, there is no reason why Theophrastus could not have used the adjective on some occasion to express moral neutrality. To be sure, the adjective occurs only once in the ethical fragments (531.17) and then it is used in a factual claim: the souls of animals and men are not naturally differ-

animal sacrifice as nothing illegal. That Theophrastus gave other examples is, I think, quite certain. Porphyry tells us that he has omitted certain myths/legends and shortened other things. The examples of the Thoës and Bassarians and the woman Clymene are cases that escaped the scalpel.

A scholium on the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes 2.1248–1250 tells us that Theophrastus explicitly credited the Titan Prometheus with giving men a share in philosophy (729.1–2). No Theophrastean work is referred to, but a reasonable guess is *On Discoveries* (727 no. 11). Perhaps Theophrastus did something similar in *On Piety*. I.e., within the initial developmental account of sacrificial practices, he named one or more individual gods as benefactors. The evidence is meager. Only Demeter is mentioned by name and then only adjectively within the phrase Δημήτρεως καρπός “fruit of Demeter” (2.6.1 = 29). There is no explicit reference to Demeter as a donor/benefactor, and while the phrase might be said to take account of Demeter as patroness of agriculture, in context it seems little more than a well used literary phrase. We may compare a scholium on Homer’s *Iliad* 1.449, in which we read, “For as Theophrastus says in *On Discoveries*, before men learned to grind Demeter’s fruit, πρὶν ἢ μάθωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀλεῖν τὸν Δημητριακὸν καρπὸν, they ate them (barley groats) intact” (730.3–5). Once again we have a reference to Demeter’s fruit,¹⁴ which is not surprising, since she is the goddess with whom barley is associated, but in context the focus is on grinding and not on Demeter *qua* benefactor.¹⁵

ent (which for Theophrastus has ethical consequences). But a single factual usage does not rule out a usage that can be seen as Stoic or an anticipation of Stoic usage. That said, there is an alternative, Porphyry may have introduced the adjective into the Theophrastean excerpt without changing the sense of the excerpt. The issue may be left undecided.

¹⁴ The variation in adjectival form (Δημητριακὸν instead Δημήτρεως) is of no consequence.

¹⁵ For an explicit reference to Demeter as a donor/benefactor, see Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 7. 191. In this section, Pliny begins an account of the discoveries/inventions of each individual: *quae cuiusque inventa sint*. Pliny first mentions the contributions of Mercury (his name must be added to the text) and Father Liber, after which he turns to Ceres (Latin for Demeter). We read; *Ceres frumenta* (sc. *invenit*), *cum antea glande vescerentur, eadem molere et conficere in Attica (ut alii, in Sicilia), ob id dea iudicata*, “Ceres discovered corn, when men had previously feed themselves with acorns; she also invented grinding and making flour in Attica (according to others in Sicily); on account of this she was deemed a goddess.” The passage is of interest for two reasons. 1) The passage well illustrates the inclusive usage of *invenire* = εὐρίσκειν (and cognate forms). Some things are there to be found, and when they are found, someone is first and credited with finding or discovering whatever it may be. Other things are not there to be found but rather need to be invented. Corn belongs to the former category, and the grinder used in the preparation of grain belongs to the latter. Hence the variation in the translation of *invenit* above. Cf. the translation of Rackham in the Loeb edition vol. 2 p. 635. Beagon (2005) p. 100 avoids the variation by translating “introduced”

Following on the reference to Demeter's fruit (2.6.1 = 584A.29), there are two passages in which reference is made to things divine. In the first, we are told that after grinding barley men "hid in a secret place the tools of the procedure, which (tools) provided divine assistance for their lives, and they approached them (the tools) as sacred objects," τὰ μὲν τῆς ἐργασίας ὄργανα θείαν τοῖς βίοις ἐπικουρίαν παρασχόντα κρύψαντες εἰς ἀπόρητον, ὡς ἱεροῖς αὐτοῖς ἀπῆντων (2.6.2 = 32–33). In the second, we read, "When men discovered for their own use different divine drops of wine and of honey and further of oil, they offered first-fruits also of these to the gods responsible (for them)," θείας ἐτέρας σταγόνας οἴνου καὶ μέλιτος ἔτι δ' ἐλαίου ταῖς χρεαῖαις ἀνευρίσκοντες ἀπῆρχοντο καὶ τούτων τοῖς αἰτίοις θεοῖς (2.6.4 = 44–46). In the second passage, the gods are honored, because they are deemed responsible for three foods found in nature. But it is man who is said to have found a use for them. That is not very different from speaking of eating barley groats intact, before man learned to grind Demeter's crop (730.5). More interesting is the first passage in which tools, the products of art or τέχνη, are said to be divine and sacred objects. The focus is not on barley, a natural food, but rather on the grinder employed in crushing barley.¹⁶ Perhaps the grinder is called sacred by transference: grain is associated with the goddess Demeter and that association is transferred to the grinder. Alternatively, we may think that inventing the grinder involved not only human ingenuity but also divine assistance. That is my preference, but I acknowledge that there is no passage within the developmental account (2.6.1–9.2 = 29–92) that makes explicit reference to dual responsibility. If one casts a wider net and considers all of the material excerpted by Porphyry (extended to 32.3 = 383), then there is one text that explicitly recognizes dual responsibility. It occurs at the end of the excerpted material: the gods are said to be jointly responsible, συναίτιοι, with us (i.e., human beings) for the fruits with which we honor them (2.32.2 = 377). But here there is no reference to artifacts like grinders. Rather, we are once again concerned with the products of nature, in regard to which both human agriculture and divine patronage play a role. Theophrastus'

corn and the art of grinding. That might be considered preferable in that one word is used to translate a single word, *invenit*, supplied from what precedes. Nevertheless, it masks the inclusive usage of *invenire* = εὐρίσκειν, which is not irrelevant when the focus is on discussions περὶ εὐρημάτων. 2) The first person to make a significant contribution to the development of human life is apt to be given divine status. In the passage under consideration, Ceres is presented as a person who made an important contribution and for that reason, *ob id*, came to be regarded as a goddess.

¹⁶ Although tools are referred to in the plural, it is clear that the focus is on the grinder.

overriding concern has been to persuade his audience to abandon blood sacrifice in favor of the vegetative. Not surprisingly, he ends (*re vera*, the excerpts end) by focusing on what comes from the earth, which is said to be the common hearth of both gods and men, κοινὴ γὰρ ἐστὶν αὕτη (*sc. ἡ γῆ*) καὶ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐστία (2.32.1 = 371–373).¹⁷

The preceding remarks concerning *On Piety* make clear that Theophrastus' interest in firsts found expression in works other than *On Discoveries*. In the latter work, interest in firsts takes center stage; in the former, this interest plays a subordinate but nevertheless impressive role. And when we compare what is said concerning grinding grain in *On Piety* (584A.29–35) with what is said concerning the same topic in *On Discoveries* (730.4–6), it is clear that Theophrastus could introduce the same material in two very different works: on one occasion as a matter of primary concern and on another as a matter of secondary importance. In the following discussion of texts dealing with “Discoveries and Beginnings” (728, 582, 579–736A–C, 718), three texts make explicit reference to *On Discoveries* (728.4, 730.4, 734.1). It is tempting to believe that the several other texts, including those that refer to the *Peplos* (582.1, 735.1–736A.1, B.1, C.3), ultimately go back to the work *On Discoveries*. But that is not certain, and even if it is the case, we must allow that some of the same material will have been incorporated into other works as well.

728 Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.16 77.1 (*GCS* vol. 2 p. 500.10–14 Stählin)

Literature: Leo (1901) p. 47; Kleingünther (1933) p. 147; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; Jax-Thraede (1962) col. 1260; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 5 pp. 83–84; Fowler (1996) pp. 73–74; Sharples (2005) p. 56; (2011) p. 183; Badino (2010) pp. 40–41, 50; Kaldellis (2012) nr. 476

Although a keen Christian, Clement of Alexandria recognized value both in the writings and in the discoveries/inventions, εὐρήματα, of earlier non-Christians, Greeks and barbarians alike. That is abundantly clear in Book 1 of Clement's *Patchwork*, where the author presents *inter alia* an overview of the Greek philosophers (Chapter 14), argues that wisdom among non-Greeks predates that of the Greeks (Chapter 15) and lists numerous discoveries¹⁸ by non-Greeks (Chapter 16). In regard to these discoveries, Clement begins

¹⁷ For completeness' sake, I refer to 2.12.2 = 102–103, where the gods are said to be the providers, πάροχοι, of the finest things, i.e., fruits, καρποί.

¹⁸ As above in discussing the title Περί εὐρημάτων (727 no. 11), I have most often but not always translated εὐρημα with “discovery.” One should keep in mind that the Greek word covers “firsts” that might be referred to more naturally as inventions, e.g. the trumpet and

by asserting that barbarians invented nearly every technical skill (1.16 74.1), after which he turns to particular accomplishments. People of many different lands are named along with their discoveries (74.2–76.10). Clement is drawing on various sources and tells us so (77.1). That is our text 728, in which he names eight persons who are said to have written works *On Discoveries*: ἐν τοῖς Περὶ εὐρημάτων ταῦτα ἱστόρησαν, “in the (works) *On Discoveries*, they recorded these things” (line 4). There follows a brief statement (not printed as part of 728), in which Clement says that the barbarians have a natural talent for discovery and that the Greeks have been beneficiaries (77.2).

Of the eight persons named by Clement in 728, Cydippus of Mantinea is known only from this passage; the same may be true of Antiphanes, unless he is the writer from Berga in Thrace, who wrote on curiosities.¹⁹ Three are well-known Peripatetics: Theophrastus, Aristotle and Strato. Of the remaining three, one belongs to the fourth century BC: namely, Scamon of Mytilene, the son of Hellanicus.²⁰ Another belongs to the third century: he is Philostephanus of Cyrene, who was closely associated with Callimachus.²¹ And the third, Aristodemus, can be dated to the second century, assuming that he is the same Aristodemus, who studied under Aristarchus of Samothrace.²²

In line 4 of 728, we have written Περὶ εὐρημάτων. The upper case Π indicates the title of a work. In regard to Theophrastus, that is perhaps unobjectionable, for Diogenes Laertius lists the title in his catalogue of Theophrastean writings (5.47 = 1.199 = 727 no. 11).²³ Since the plural verb

the alphabet, mentioned by Clement at *Patchwork* 1.16 74.6 and 75.1. Occasionally it seems natural to speak of something that is found: e.g. iron at 75.4.

¹⁹ See W. Kroll, “Kydippos,” *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 11 (1922) col. 2303, Ferguson (1991) p. 82 n. 373 and Sharples p. 183 n. 1 and 2.

²⁰ *Suda* s.v. Ἑλλάνικος (*LG* vol. 1.2 p. 238.19 Adler = *FGrH* 4 T 1). See F. Jacoby, “Skamon,” *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, zweite Reihe 3 (1929) col. 437. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.28 630B refers to the first book of Scamon’s work Περὶ εὐρημάτων, thereby implying that the work was at least two books long.

²¹ According to Servius, *On Vergil’s Georgics* 1.19, Philostephanus wrote a work called Περὶ εὐρημάτων. See F. Gisinger, “Philostephanos 7” *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 20.1 (1941) col. 104–118; on Περὶ εὐρημάτων see col. 111–112. See also Badino pp. 40–41 and 50, where 728 appears as testimony no. 2.

²² Here I am following E. Schwartz, “Aristodems 28” and “Aristodemos 29,” *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 2 (1896) col. 925. Aristarchus of Samothrace was head of the Library in Alexander from c. 180–145 BC.

²³ I have written “perhaps” for one might object that not all the titles found in Diogenes’ catalogue are proper titles or at least not titles that were assigned by Theophrastus. For some discussion, see White (above, p. 68 n. 5) pp. 19–20 and my *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 126–127.

ιστόρησαν (in the sentence ἐν τοῖς Περὶ εὐρημάτων ταῦτα ἰστόρησαν, line 4) is not restricted to Theophrastus but goes, at least grammatically, with all eight of the authors named by Clemens, we may want to say that all eight wrote works entitled Περὶ εὐρημάτων. And that might be what Clemens intends. But if it were his intention, then he almost certainly erred, at least in the case of Strato. In Diogenes' catalogue of Strato's writings, we find the title Εὐρημάτων ἔλεγχοι δύο (Diogenes 5.60 = Strato, text 82 no. 10 Sharples). That is likely to be Strato's own title. He became head of the Peripatetic School in 286 BC and remained in that position until 268. If we accept that the assignation of titles by authors became common in the fourth century and that in general the Theophrastean titles listed by Diogenes are those assigned by Theophrastus,²⁴ then it seems reasonable to believe that Strato assigned titles to his own works. I know of no good reason to believe that Diogenes has Strato's title wrong, or that Strato wrote two works, Εὐρημάτων ἔλεγχοι δύο and Περὶ εὐρημάτων, of which the latter was omitted by Diogenes. Should we, then, say that Clement has erred? I think not, for more than likely Clement has used the phrase περὶ εὐρημάτων descriptively (lower case π). In the case of Theophrastus, the phrase does correspond to the author's title, but in the case of Strato it does not. For Strato's title refers to ἔλεγχοι (refutations or examinations or lists [see above, p. 109]). I conclude that in a second edition of the text-translation volumes, περὶ should be printed and not Περὶ in 728.4.²⁵

The structure or ordering of Clement's list merits brief comment. It begins with the names of three persons, to each of which a place name is attached. The order may be chronological, if Cydippus is younger than Theophrastus, but even if he is, that may not reflect Clement's intention. More likely Clement is simply following a source without regard to chronology. Were that important to Clement, Aristotle would be named before Theophrastus.²⁶ Each of the five names that follow on the first three is recorded without a place name. That marks them off as does the use of conjunctions. Before Antiphanes, Aristodemus and Aristotle we read ἔτι τε, "and also" (line 2).

²⁴ See the preceding note.

²⁵ It is, I think, a mistake to attribute to Aristotle a work that carried the title Περὶ εὐρημάτων. See above, Chapter III "Titles of Books" no. 11.

²⁶ Kaldellis in *Brill's New Jacoby* no. 476 T 3: "Skamon may be cited first not because he was the earliest chronologically but because his was the most complete treatise of this kind or because he was Clement's direct source for the others (or some of them)." The idea that Skamon was Clement's direct source for the other sources is unlikely or rather impossible, if one accepts that Skamon was the son of Hellanicus and belongs to the fourth century BC.

And before Philostephanus and Strato we read πρὸς τούτοις δέ, “and in addition” (line 3). Assuming that Clement has his material from earlier authors who cite the persons named, the introduction of conjunctions may correspond to a shift in secondary source, but that is speculation. Why Strato alone is identified as a Peripatetic, while Theophrastus and Aristotle are not, may also be explained by a shift in secondary source. A reasonable guess, but again certainty is elusive.

Theophrastus is cited in regard to discoveries by non-Greeks. That is hardly surprising, for the Greeks in general recognized that civilization in the East predates their own, and that important discoveries arrived in Greece from the East. The question arises whether Theophrastus can be connected with one or more of the non-Greek discoveries listed by Clement. The answer is yes, providing we are not claiming that making a connection with Clement entails drawing directly on Theophrastus. Here are two cases. 1) When Clement tells us that Cadmus the Phoenician invented stone-cutting, i.e. quarries (1.16 75.8), a connection can be made with Pliny’s statement that according to Theophrastus Cadmus invented quarries in Phoenicia (732.1). 2) When Clement says that the Idaean Delas discovered the alloy of bronze (1.16 75.4), we can compare Pliny’s report that according to Theophrastus Delas the Phrygian showed how to fuse and allow bronze (731.1–2). Here the mention of Phrygia in Pliny and the reference to Ida in Clement do not rule out a connection, for “Phrygia” could be used in reference to the region of the Troad around Mt. Ida.²⁷ For completeness’ sake, I add a third case that is highly speculative but nonetheless of some interest: When Clement tells us that the Egyptians were the inventors of geometry (1.16 74.2), we may recall that Diogenes Laertius attributes to Theophrastus a work entitled Ἰστορικῶν γεωμετρικῶν α'–δ', *Geometrical Researches*, 4 books (5.48 = 1.245). The attribution and the content of the work are disputed,²⁸ but it seems that a work, whose title refers to geometry, might mention (in an introductory section, if nowhere else) the Egyptians in regard to early work on mathematical subjects. But it is best not to speculate further. Instead, I conclude that at least some of the barbarian discoveries listed by Clement will have had roots in a Theophrastean work.

²⁷ See below pp. 164–165 with n. 76.

²⁸ See above, p. 170.

582 John Scotus Eriugena,²⁹ *On Martianus Capella* 1.10 p. 10.6 Dick, cod. B f. 7^v (*Med. and Ren. St.* vol. 1 [1941–1943] p. 189 Labowsky)

Literature]; Labowsky (1941–1943) pp. 189–190; Sheldon-Williams (1973) p. 3

In the text-translation volumes, 582 will be found among the texts that have been grouped together in the section on “Religion” and under the sub-heading “Gods and Goddesses.” In *Commentary* 6b on religion, 582 will be discussed by Stefan Schorn. It is discussed here in *Commentary* 9a, because it focuses on the beginning of Apollo’s role as prophet and for that reason has been referred to from the section on “Discoveries and Beginnings.”

Text 582 is a comment by Eriugena on the phrase “*augur Pythius*,” which occurs in Martianus Capella’s work *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury* 1.10. The context in Martianus is Mercury’s decision to marry (1.5) and his initial failure to find a suitable wife (1.6–7). He had been advised by Virtue to seek the counsel of Apollo and with her set out to find him. They looked for Apollo in places where it was customary for prophecies to be told and omens revealed, but without success (1.8–10). At this point, Martianus explains, *iam pridem quippe offensus contaminate monendorum dedignatur augur Pythius nuncupari*, “Indeed long ago, distressed by contact with those who sought his advice,³⁰ he had rejected the name ‘Pythian prophet’” (1.10).

There are two versions of Eriugena’s comment on the phrase *augur Pythius*, “Pythian prophet.” One version is our text 582, which is found in codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct. T. II 19 (p. 189 Labowsky = p. 116.6–9 Jeaneau [1978]). The other occurs in codex Parisinus Bibliothecae Nationalis Lat. 12960 (p. 16.16–23 Lutz [1939]). It is longer and preceded by a comment on the words *contaminate monendorum*, which is missing in the Oxford codex. For ease of comparison, I give here both versions of the comment.

²⁹ On “Eriugena” as against “Erigena,” see above, p. 35 n. 101.

³⁰ “Distressed by contact with those who sought his advice” translates *offensus contaminate monendorum*. The translation is that of W. Stahl, R. Johnson and E. Burge in *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts* (New York: Columbia 1977) p. 8. Their translation seems to me correct, but it differs from the way in which Eriugena (in his comment as recorded in one codex) and Remigius construe the purpose of sacrificing. Is the person who performs a sacrifice seeking advice or giving it? See below, p. 149 n. 35.

Oxford codex

Augur Pithius: In Peplo Theophrasti legitur quendam serpentem prophetasse in Delo insula, quem occidit Apollo, et inde cepit postea prophetare, ideoque augur Pithius vocatus est.

“The Pythian prophet”: In the *Robe* of Theophrastus we read that a certain serpent prophesied on the island of Delos; Apollo killed it, and thence began subsequently to prophesy (himself), and for that reason he was called the Pythian prophet.

Paris codex

Contamine monendorum: contagione cruoris hostiarum. Monenda dicuntur sacrificia quia per ipsa ab hominibus admonebantur dii.

Augur pithius: Apollo est vocatus quia fanum illius in Delo insula in quo auguria manifestabat Pithium est nominatum sive a Pithone serpente cuius corium fuerat illic extensum, ut fabulae fingunt, sive, ut verior ratio dicit, a verbo πεύθομαι, hoc est consulo vel interrogo. in praefato quippe fano consulebatur et interrogabatur Apollo. et est sensus: propterea Apollo dedignatus est augur Pithius vocari, quoniam nimia cruoris effusi circa fanum Pithium offensus est putredine.

“By contact with the sacrifices”: by contact with the blood of the sacrifices (the sacrificial victims). Sacrifices are called *monenda*, because through them the gods were admonished by men.

“The Pythian prophet”: Apollo was called (Pythian prophet), because his sanctuary on the island of Delos, in which he used to put forth prophecies, was named Pythian, either from the serpent Pytho whose skin had been stretched out there, as myths fabricate, or as the truer account states, from the verb *“peuthomai,”* i.e., “I consult” or “I question.” Indeed in the aforementioned sanctuary, Apollo was consulted and questioned. And the thought is: therefore Apollo rejected the name “Pythian prophet,” for he was offended by the excessive stench of blood poured out around the Pythian sanctuary.

The Paris codex tells us that Apollo acquired the epithet “Pythian” from his sanctuary on Delos, and that the sanctuary was called “Pythian” for one of two possible reasons. One is mythological and invokes Apollo *qua* serpent slayer; the other avoids myth and focuses on the verb *πυνθάνομαι*. The first possibility is rejected and the second is accepted as the *ratio verior*, “the truer account.” The Oxford codex is shorter: discussion of the name of the sanctuary is missing and with it the recognition of two possibilities, one of which is referred to myth and the other to reason. Furthermore, there is no explanation of the preceding phrase *contamine monendorum*. According to Labowsky, the difference between the two codices reflects a general difference between Eriugena’s comments on Book 1 of Martianus’

work. The Oxford codex frequently offers briefer explanations, while those of the Paris codex tend to be more elaborate. The briefer represent an earlier version and the fuller a later version.

Locating the legend of Apollo and the serpent on the island of Delos seems wrongheaded. Delphi is the traditional location.³¹ Labowsky offers three possible explanations. 1) Eriugena was misled by the mention of Delos in the sentence that follows immediately in Martianus' text; 2) Eriugena failed to understand the *Peplos/Robe* of Theophrastus, "which he evidently used"; 3) his source actually referred to a tradition, according to which the legend of the serpent was located on Delos. Each of these explanations is possible, but none can claim certainty. 1) In the sentence that follows immediately, we are told that Virtue and Mercury pursued Apollo to Helicon, Delos and Lycium (so the codices; in Dick's edition Lycium is corrected to Lyciam); in one place they found old laurel and withered ivy, in another a rotting tripod, sandals covered with mold and a record of prophecies that had been erased. (p. 10.6–10 Dick). The mention of Delos suits Apollo, for tradition makes Delos his place of birth. And the reference to Lycium can be understood as a reference to the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos.³² In addition, the mention of a record of prophecies that had been erased or canceled might fit Apollo's alleged dissatisfaction with his role as prophet. Taken together these details might have influenced Eriugena to ignore Delphi in favor of Delos, but if so we must imagine him ignoring a longstanding tradition according to which Apollo slew the serpent at Delphi. 2) If Eriugena had Theophrastus' *Peplos* as his source, then he may well have misunderstood it. Certainly it is hard to imagine Theophrastus himself moving Apollo's role as serpent slayer to Delos. That said it, remains possible that Eriugena correctly reported what he read, but he may have consulted the *Peplos* through an intermediary that misreported what Theophrastus wrote. Or perhaps Theophrastus did not write the *Peplos* that came to be known as his. In that

³¹ On Apollo slaying the serpent at Delphi and prophesying there, see *Homeric Hymn* 3.300–304, Euripides, *Iphigeneia at Taurus* 1244–1258 and other texts cited in the apparatus of parallel texts to 582.

³² It might be objected that the correction "Lycia" gives a better fit when placed along side Helicon and Delos, for each has its own geographical location: Helicon is in Boeotia; Delos is an island southwest of Myconos; Lycia is on the southern coast of Asia Minor. Moreover, Lycia is mentioned in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 3.179 as belonging to Apollo. But Lycium following on Delos is quite intelligible: Eriugena, having mentioned the island of Delos, adds a reference to the sanctuary of Apollo on that island. Moreover, Remegius in his commentary not only has "Lycium" but also states that Lycium is the greatest sanctuary on Delos and the reason why Apollo is called Lycius (p. 84.32–33 Lutz).

case, the *Peplos* may have been the depository for all sorts of misinformation including what Eriugena reports.³³ 3) The possibility that Eriugena worked with a source that moved the legend of the serpent to Delos cannot be disproved and finds some support in Servius' *Commentary on Vergil's Aeneid*, 3.73, for after describing the island of Delos as most pleasing to Neptune and Doris, Servius briefly reports the story of Jupiter violating Latona and the subsequent birth of Diana and Apollo. The latter is said to have been born second and to have straightway killed the serpent, with which Juno was tormenting Latona (p. 34.1–15 Stocker-Travis). But if the third possibility is accepted, we still may wonder how this story came to be included in or attributed to a work known as Theophrastus' *Peplos*. I leave the issue undecided.³⁴

If Labowsky is correct and the Paris codex edited by Lutz contains a version of Eriugena's commentary that is later than that found in the Oxford codex, then the question arises, whether something transpired that led Eriugena to omit a reference to the *Peplos* in the later version. Rather than guess, I refer to Remigius, whose commentary on Martianus' work agrees with the Oxford version not only in omitting a reference to the *Peplos* of Theophrastus but also in explaining the offense felt by Apollo as a negative reaction to the blood and filth involved in sacrifices: Eriugena writes *contagione cruoris hostiarum* (p. 16.14 Lutz) and Remigius *contamine, id est spurcitia* (sc. *sacrificiorum* p. 84.17 Lutz).³⁵ In addition, both offer alternative explanations of the name *augur Pythius* and both prefer the linguistic explanation: Eriugena writes *verior ratio* (p. 16.19), Remigius *melius* (p. 84.22). In regard to the linguistic explanation, the two commentators are embracing bad etymology. In Πυθώ (the older name for Delphi) and Πύθων (the name of the serpent slain

³³ On the *Peplos/Robe*, see above, Chapter III "Titles of Books" no. 10.

³⁴ According to Labowsky p. 189 n. 2, Th. Schreiber, *Apollon Pythoktonos* (1987) p. 46 assumed that there existed a version of the story that located the slaying of the serpent in Delos. Labowsky cites Servius, *Commentary on Vergil's Aeneid* 3.73 and then adds, "But it is unlikely that the name of *Pythian* oracle should have been transferred to Delos by any ancient writer."

³⁵ Eriugena and Remigius also agree in explaining *monenda* as *sacrificia*. Eriugena writes *monenda dicuntur sacrificia quia per ipsa ab hominibus admonebantur dii*, "sacrifices are called *monenda*, because through them the gods were admonished by men" (p. 16.14–15 Lutz), and Remigius comments *monenda enim dicuntur sacrificia per quae dii monentur ut succurrant mortalibus*, "for sacrifices through which the gods are admonished to assist mortals are called *monenda*" (p. 84.18–19 Lutz). This appears to have things backwards: the person who performs a sacrifice to Apollo is seeking advice from the god and not advising him that it is his duty to provide assistance. See above, p. 146 n. 30.

by Apollo) the upsilon is long and therefore to be connected with πύθειν (to make rot; pass. πυθέσθαι, to become rotten), which has a long upsilon, and not with πυυθάνεσθαι, which has a short upsilon. See LSJ s.v. Πυθώ and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 3.371–374, according to which the sun's force caused the serpent to rot and from that the region (Delphi and the environs) came to be called Pytho and Apollo acquired the epithet Pythian.

Referring to text 582 within a section on “Discoveries and Beginnings” may seem a bit of a stretch. No human being is reported to have discovered or invented something new. Rather a god has killed a serpent that prophesied and subsequently taken up prophesying (himself), *cepit postea prophetare*. On the other hand, the text reports (erroneously) the origin of the Pythian oracle, which was important to men and nations in antiquity. We might say that it falls under “firsts”: Apollo first began to prophesy to men who sought his advice after he had killed the serpent.

729 Scholium on the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius 2.1248–1250 (a, p. 212.3–6 Wendel)

Literature: Leo (1901) p. 48; Kraus (1957) col. 684–685, 694; Sharples (2005) p. 56; Zhmud (2001) p. 14, (2006) p. 43

Text 729 is part of a scholium on lines 1248–1250 of Book 2 of Apollonius' *Argonautica*. In the poem, the lines are found shortly before the end of the Book. The Argonauts have been sailing along the southern coast of the Black Sea and are now approaching Colchis, where they intend to recover the golden fleece. Apollonius gives a brief description of the Caucasian mountains, which come into view as the ship reaches its destination. After that he jumps to mythology, telling us that the Titan Prometheus is bound fast to the steep cliffs, while an eagle feeds on his liver. That is a typical display of Alexandrian learning,³⁶ which Apollonius enlivens by describing how the Argonauts saw the eagle fly over head toward the mountain to which Prometheus is bound, heard the cries of Prometheus as his liver was being torn out, and again saw the eagle as it flew back from the mountain (1251–1259).

The scholium begins with a succinct statement of the content of lines 1248–1250: “Prometheus was bound on Mt. Caucasia and the eagle ate his

³⁶ Only a few lines earlier, Apollonius mentions the island of Philyra, which prompts him to introduce the myth of Philyra, Ocean's daughter, who was caught in bed with Zeus (1231–1241).

liver" (p. 211.16–17 W). After that the interpretations and comments of four authorities are reported (211.18–212.15): Agroitas of Cyrene, 3rd or 2nd century BC (*FGrH* 762 F 4), Theophrastus (729), Herodorus of Heraclea on the Pontus, 400 BC or earlier (*FGrH* 31 F 30) and Pherekydes of Athens, mid-5th century BC (*FGrH* 3 F 7). All the reports are quite brief; that concerning Theophrastus is the briefest. It runs as follows:

Θεόφραστος δὲ τὸν Προμηθέα φησὶ σοφὸν γενόμενον μεταδοῦναι πρῶτον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις φιλοσοφίας, ὅθεν καὶ διαδοθῆναι τὸν μῦθον ὡς ἄρα πυρὸς μεταδοίη.

Theophrastus says Prometheus, who was wise, was the first to give men a share in philosophy, and for this reason also the story was handed down that he gave them a share in fire.³⁷

The report relates closely to traditional mythology. In Hesiod's *Theogony* we read not only of the eagle feeding on Prometheus's liver but also of Prometheus being subtle in counsel (ποικιλόβουλος 521) and knowledgeable in schemes (μήδεα εἰδώς 559). When Zeus deprived men of fire, Prometheus returned it to men hidden in the hollow of a fennel stalk (565–567). And in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, the eponymous Titan asserts that he made men intelligent and possessed of understanding (444), after which he lists the many benefits that he bestowed on men. Along the way, he uses the adjective "first" (πρῶτος 462) in regard to himself (462), speaks of making discoveries (ἐξευρεῖν 460, 469, 503) and making gifts (διδόναι 446), which are characterized in terms of art or skill (τέχνη 477, 497, 506). Taken together, the texts of Hesiod and Aeschylus account for most of what the scholium says. Prometheus is wise at least in technical skills; he is the first to do things and may be described as a donor among inventors: i.e., he shared fire with mankind.

We may wonder about the reference to philosophy. According to the scholiast, Theophrastus said that Prometheus gave men a share in philosophy, and for this reason also the story was handed down that Prometheus gave men a share in fire. Here Theophrastus explains a tradition concerning fire by reference to philosophy. That might be thought odd, for whereas fire is fundamental to many skills or arts, τέχναι, we (moderns) do not normally think of philosophy as an art, and we do not find it listed by Aeschylus

³⁷ The translation is that printed in the text-translation volumes with two minor exceptions: twice I have omitted "that" where it was used to mark the beginning of indirect discourse dependent upon φησί. I have, however, retained the third occurrence of "that" where it translates ὡς.

among Prometheus' gifts to mankind. Nevertheless, the oddity may be more apparent than real. Three considerations follow.

- 1) The *Prometheus Bound* is a work of the mid-fifth century,³⁸ when the term τέχνη was used inclusively not only of productive and practical skills but also of those that are neither productive nor practical. That is of some significance, for the list of Prometheus' gifts to mankind concludes with the statement that every art, πᾶσαι τέχναι, comes from Prometheus (506). Here τέχναι might be construed to include non-practical arts that at later time would fall under philosophy or more generally under leisured study.³⁹ Indeed, the list of Prometheus' gifts includes number (459) and the rising and settings of planets (457), which might be construed as arithmetic and astronomy, and which are like philosophy in having no necessary tie to practical or productive activities.⁴⁰
- 2) In the fifth and fourth centuries, Isocrates uses "philosophy" widely, so that it covers both practical wisdom and leisured study.⁴¹ I cite the *Busiris*, for in this work Isocrates concerns himself with the legendary Egyptian king Busiris, who is said to have created a class of priests who were temperate and leisured and who are credited not only with discovering medical treatment for the body but also with introducing the practice of philosophy for the soul. The latter, we are told, makes

³⁸ *Prometheus Bound* is a late work of Aeschylus, who died in 456 BC.

³⁹ Zhmud (2006) p. 33: "Aeschylean Prometheus ... calls himself the inventor of πᾶσαι τέχναι (506) ... in a word, every sphere through which social life is civilized. Greek thought at that time does not make any fundamental distinction between practical and unpractical discoveries."

⁴⁰ Zhmud (2006) p. 33 construes number and the rising and setting of planets in terms of arithmetic and astronomy. I have expressed myself cautiously, writing "might be construed," for a different interpretation that emphasizes the practical is possible. Whereas number is referred to as preeminent among clever contrivances (459), that description may do no more than emphasize the practical importance of counting and measuring. Similarly the reference to the risings and settings of planets (457) may be concerned with knowledge useful to farmers and seafarers and not with a theoretical science such as astronomy. So too the reference to letters (460) need not indicate some advanced study like logic or even a practical art like rhetoric. Rather, the focus might be on writing as an aid to memory (461).

⁴¹ Isocrates lived almost one hundred years, from 436 to 338 BC. While Isocrates primary concern might be described as rhetoric, he himself often uses the term "philosophy" which includes more than rhetoric and makes room for leisured study, which is different from idle speculation. See the glossary of David Mirhady and Yun Lee Too, *Isocrates I* (Austin: University of Texas 2000) p. 267, where the authors state succinctly that Isocrates' "idea of philosophy combines politics and study with above all skill at using language." The authors refer to *Busiris* 22, to which I refer in what follows.

it possible both to legislate and to investigate the nature of being. Here philosophy seems to be used widely for practical wisdom and more generally for study free from immediate constraints. The same may be true of 729, but without additional context, that cannot be determined.⁴²

- 3) In text 729, the gift of philosophy is mentioned before the gift of fire. At first reading, that might seem to have things backwards. Any credible account of mankind's development from the earliest times to the present would place the giving or discovery of fire, i.e., its practical use in satisfying basic human needs (warmth, cooking, making clay vessels, etc.) at a time well before man began doing philosophy construed as the study of matters that are not closely tied to everyday needs. True enough, but there need be no difficulty here. Properly understood, 729 is not concerned with prehistory, i.e., what in fact came first and what came second as human life evolved. Rather, 729 is concerned with myth and in particular with the story of Prometheus sharing fire with men. That myth, we are told, followed from Prometheus' giving men a share in philosophy. Or as the scholiast puts it, Prometheus' giving philosophy is the reason for which, ὅθεν, the myth concerning fire was handed down.⁴³ Fair enough, but what is it about giving philosophy that prompts a myth concerning fire? My guess is that both philosophy and fire are illuminating. Doing philosophy clarifies our thinking and fire makes it possible to see with clarity. Hence we can say metaphorically that when Prometheus gave men philosophy he gave them fire.⁴⁴

⁴² Before leaving Isocrates, it should be noted that in the *Antidosis*, Isocrates attributes the discovery of philosophy to certain men who are said to have lived long before his own time, πρὸ ἡμῶν (181). That does not mean that Isocrates has changed his mind during the period between the composition of the *Busiris* and that of the *Antidosis*. Rather, we should pay attention to context. In the *Busiris*, Isocrates is focused on a legendary Egyptian king, so that referring to a class of Egyptian priests is readily accepted. In the *Antidosis*, Isocrates is focused on Athens and his own mode of instruction (182–185). In this context a vague reference to an older generation is adequate and perhaps intended to leave room for unique contributions by Isocrates himself.

⁴³ The giving of philosophy to men is treated as the reason for which the myth concerning fire arose. Hence our translation of ὅθεν, “for this reason” (see LSJ s.v. II). A consideration of passages in Plato and Clement will render intelligible the scholiast's use of ὅθεν. See below.

⁴⁴ We may compare Aristotle's *Rhetoric* 3.10 1411b12–13. There Aristotle lists examples of metaphor based on analogy, one of which runs as follows: τὸν νοῦν ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἀνῆψεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, “The god kindled intellect/reason as a light in the soul.” Aristotle adds by way of explanation: ἀμφω γὰρ δηλοῖ τι, “For both show something,” E. Cope, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary*, revised by J. Sandys (Cambridge: University Press) vol. 3 p. 123 comments: “This is a proportional metaphor. As light to material, so reason to intellectual objects.”

Two Platonic dialogues are relevant. The earlier of the two is the *Protagoras*, in which the eponymous Sophist presents a mythical account of the genesis of mankind. We are told that the gods created mortal creatures out of earth and fire. Epimetheus undertook the task of assigning appropriate qualities to each kind. Being less than wise, he forgot about man, so that when the time came for mortal creatures to appear on earth, man lacked the means to survive. Prometheus came to the rescue by stealing for man the technical wisdom (ἐντεχνος σοφία 322D) of Hephaestus and Athena along with fire, for without fire the wisdom in question could neither be acquired nor used. Here we have fire in second position, its presence being required by technical skills. But philosophy is not part of the story. That comes in a later dialogue, Plato's *Philebus*, in which Socrates turns his attention to philosophic method, i.e., to dialectic, which is first introduced in the *Phaedrus*, where it is characterized in terms of collection and division.⁴⁵ Now in the *Philebus*, Socrates speaks of it as a gift of the gods that came to man through the agency of a certain Prometheus (διὰ τινος Προμηθέως) together with a certain very bright fire (ἅμα φανοτάτῳ τινὶ πυρὶ 16C). The use of the indefinite τις indicates that the reader is not to press the details. In particular, we are to understand that the use of πῦρ in conjunction with philosophic method is not to be taken literally. Rather, it refers to the way in which Platonic dialectic is thought to illuminate subjects under discussion.

Comparison with a remark of Clement of Alexandria can be helpful. In Book 1 of *Patchwork*, Clement writes, ἔστιν οὖν κἀν φιλοσοφίᾳ, τῇ κλαπίσῃ καθάπερ ὑπὸ Προμηθέως, πῦρ ὀλίγον εἰς φῶς ἐπιτήδειον χρησίμως ζῶπυρούμενον, ἔχον τι σοφίας καὶ κίνησις περὶ θεοῦ, "there is, therefore, in philosophy,⁴⁶ stolen as it were by Prometheus, a little fire which is kindled usefully into suitable light, a certain trace of wisdom and an impulse in regard to God" (1.17 87.1). Here Clement expresses himself as a Christian, who believes that pagan philosophers can be helpful in leading one to God. The philosophy stolen by Prometheus is that of the Greeks. The qualifier καθάπερ is added as an acknowledgement that Prometheus belongs to myth, and the fire that comes with philosophy is explained as enlightening. It is not the knowledge of Christ but rather a trace of wisdom, which may move a person toward God. Whatever one thinks of Clement's theology, it is clear that he agrees

⁴⁵ See *Phaedrus* 265D–266B.

⁴⁶ The use of "in" makes clear that the fire in question is not separate from philosophy, not a later add on. Rather the enlightening quality of philosophy, its fire, is a fundamental characteristic.

not only with Plato but also with the scholiast in using fire metaphorically in order to emphasize the illuminating power of philosophy.

Given these points of agreement between the scholiast on the one hand and Plato and Clement on the other, there is no reason to say that the scholiast has things backwards. In some context, Theophrastus will have spoken first of Prometheus giving men a share in philosophy and then referred to the myth according to which Prometheus gave men fire understood as philosophy's power to illuminate/enlighten. It is a reasonable guess that the scholiast's report goes back to *On Discoveries* (727 no. 11), which will have made room for mythological figures as well as persons who lived at a particular time and made particular contributions to the development of Greek culture.

I conclude this comment with a brief look at a possible objection: namely, that the above interpretation is out of line with what Theophrastus says in the work *On Piety*.⁴⁷ There fire is not given to man along with philosophy but rather present at the very beginning, when man burnt grass as a sacrifice to the gods (584A.1–14). True enough, but what Theophrastus presents in *On Piety* is not in all details his considered view. I do not doubt that he opposed animal sacrifice, but there is little reason to believe that he was focused on an earliest period when man already had fire, which was used in sacrificing to the gods. Rather, Theophrastus chooses to give fire and grass pride of place in his account of sacrifice not only because he thinks vegetable matter basic to sacrifice but also because his account is devolutionary.⁴⁸ It moves from the harmless sacrifice of grasses and fruits, which all persons can offer, to the sacrifice of human beings and to the sacrifice of animals, both of which are harmful and beyond the reach of poor people. Placing animal sacrifice last is significant. For whether it actually followed human sacrifice or not is unimportant to Theophrastus. He places it at the bottom of a devolutionary spiral, because he wants to impress the reader with its awfulness. In another work, he might adopt a different account of human progress,⁴⁹ or he might be interested in traditional myths as reported by other people. In *On Discoveries*, the latter will have played a role: text 729

⁴⁷ I am grateful to Stefan Schorn for formulating the objection.

⁴⁸ See above, the introduction pp. 138–139.

⁴⁹ According to Zhmud (2001) p. 14, Theophrastus, in his work *On Discoveries*, wrote that Prometheus founded philosophy, while in his doxographical work there is no Prometheus; philosophy began with Thales. With the second part of Zhmud's statement I have no quarrel; we should, however, be clear text 729 makes no reference to *On Discoveries*.

may well go back to that work. But that is a guess. A collection of *Memoranda* (727 no. 7 and 8) cannot be ruled out.

730 Scholium on Homer's *Iliad* 1.449 (*SIFC* vol. 77⁵⁰ [1984] p. 199 de Marco)

Literature: Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; de Marco (1984) pp. 197–200; G. Clark (2000) p. 145 n. 217; Sharples (2005) pp. 56–57

Text 730 is a marginal comment on line 449 of Book 1 of Homer's *Iliad*. In what precedes line 449, Homer tells of Odysseus returning Chryseis, the daughter of Chryses, to her father, the priest of Apollo in the city of Thebe. The Greeks had sacked the city, taken Chryseis captive and assigned her to Agamemnon, the leader of the Greeks. When Chryses petitioned that she be returned, Agamemnon refused. Chryses responded by praying to Apollo that the Greeks be punished. Apollo honored the request and caused a plague to break out among the Greeks, so that Agamemnon was forced to relent. Odysseus was sent to return the girl and to perform a sacrifice to Apollo in order that the god might be appeased. Our text 730 comments on the beginning of the sacrifice. Homer says that persons charged with performing the sacrifice washed their hands and took up barley-groats/grains for scattering, οὐλοχύτας ἀνέλοντο (1.449). The scholiast offers a two part comment. First, he tells us that οὐλοχύτας refers to barley-groats, οὐλαί, which are mixed with salt and scattered on the sacrificial animals before they are sacrificed either for the sake of abundance or in memory of the ancient diet (lines 1–3). Second, the scholiast names Theophrastus, commenting that in his work *On Discoveries* Theophrastus says that prior to learning how to grind Demeter's crop, men ate barley-groats in this way, i.e., intact; hence the poet (Homer) calls them "whole" (lines 3–6).

In the immediately preceding lines, I have used the phrase "prior to learning how to grind Demeter's crop." That translates the words πρὶν ἢ μάθωσιν ... ἀλεῖν τὸν Δημητρίκον καρπὸν (lines 4–5). The infinitive ἀλεῖν is rendered by "to grind." De Marco has objected that συλλέγειν should be read instead of ἀλεῖν, even though συλλέγειν is found in a single codex C, whereas ἀλεῖν occurs in A and three other codices.⁵¹ In support of his view, he says that it appears impossible to understand how συλλέγειν mutated into

⁵⁰ *SIFC* vol. 77 = *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, terza serie 2.

⁵¹ Sigla C and A are explained above, Chapter II "The Sources" no. 17, scholia on Homer. The sigla of the other three codices are H = Vindobonensis phil. Graecus 117, 13th century; R = Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct. T.2.7, 12th century; V = Monacensis Graecus 16 (Victorinus), 16th century.

ἄλειν, and that the phrases ποιεῖσθαι παράθεςιν in Diodorus Siculus (*Library of History* 8.6) and *componere opes* in Virgil (*Aeneid* 8.317) support reading συλλέγειν. I am not convinced. As I see it, a person who is tired or working in haste might be misled by the letters λειν (in ἄλειν) and write συλλέγειν. In addition, the scholion speaks of the diet of ancient times when men ate barley-grains intact or whole, σῶας (line 6). The implied contrast with a later time when men began to eat grain that was no longer whole is best captured when ἄλειν is read. Moreover, however interesting the passages in Diogenes and Virgil may be, they are not as important as what we read in 584A.29–37 (= Porphyrius, *On Abstinence from Eating Animals* 2.6.1–2). For in these lines from Theophrastus' work *On Piety* (580 no. 3),⁵² Theophrastus speaks of sacrifices before and after men learned to grind grain, and he does so in language similar to that of 730. The phrase “the crop/fruit of Demeter” occurs in both places (730.5 and 584A.29)⁵³ as does the verb ἄλειν (the active infinitive occurs in 730.5 and the passive participle in 584A.34). Hence, I am not prepared to follow De Marco.

In the first part of the scholium, Theophrastus is not named. Nevertheless, the phrase πολυπληθείας χάριν, “for the sake of abundance,” i.e., “to signify/make a display of abundance” (line 3) invites comparison with at least two Theophrastean texts. One is 523.1–3 (= Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.3.42), in which we are told that the man who is going to be admired for his relationship to the divinity is not one who offers large sacrifices but rather sacrifices frequently. The reason is clear enough. Large sacrifices attract attention, may be self-serving rather than expressions of piety and are impossible for persons who lack the requisite means.⁵⁴ The other is 584A.125–134 (= Porphyry, *On Abstinence* 2.13.3–4, from *On Piety*), where we read that Theophrastus opposes animal sacrifice. He prefers what is inexpensive, for it is agreeable to the gods and available for continual expressions of piety. That said, it should be noted that the Homeric passage on which the scholiast comments concerns animal sacrifice and that in some contexts a display of

⁵² The lines are included in all collections of Theophrastean excerpts: Bernays (1866) pp. 40–41, Pötscher (1964) p. 148, Fortenbaugh (1984) p. 55 and (1992) vol. 2 p. 406 See also Bouffartigue p. 20, 29. Porphyry himself does not tell us that he is drawing on the work *On Piety*, but comparing Porphyry 2.21.1 = 584A.176–178 with a scholium on Aristophanes, *Birds* 1354 and Photius, *Lexicon*, s.v. κύρβεις (both app. 584A) makes clear that in *On Abstinence* 2 Porphyry's Theophrastean excerpts are drawn from the work *On Piety*.

⁵³ In both places, we have an adjective, though different in form. Δημητριακός is found in 730.5 and Δημήτριος in 584A.29.

⁵⁴ On text 523, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 520–532.

abundance is entirely in order. In the *Iliad*, the sacrifice is intended to appease Apollo, so that erring on the side of abundance seems appropriate. And if one accepts the Peripatetic doctrine of the mean, it seems reasonable that a person of great wealth would engage in expensive sacrifice on important occasions.⁵⁵ Only if 584A fairly represents Theophrastus, then he at least would insist that whatever the occasion an expensive sacrifice ought not to include animals.⁵⁶

The beginning of the second part of the scholium is straightforward. The scholiast connects groats with ancient times: he refers to Theophrastus' work *On Discoveries* (727 no. 11) and reports that in this work Theophrastus said that men ate barley-groats whole or intact, σῶας αὐτάς ἥσθιον, before they learned to grind grain (lines 4–5). If there is a difficulty, it is in what follows. For the scholiast adds, ὅθεν οὐλὰς αὐτάς φησιν ὁ ποιητής, “hence (for this reason) the poet calls them οὐλαί” (line 6). At first reading, the derivation may seem correct, for while the Attic adjective for “whole” is ὅλος (rough breathing), Homer’s *Odyssey* exhibits the form οὔλος (smooth breathing, 17.343, 24.118). Nevertheless, the difference in the position of the accent is telling: the noun and the adjective are unrelated words. See LSJ s.v. οὐλαί and οὔλος (A). Perhaps the last line was added by the scholiast or his source and is not to be attributed to Theophrastus. But the ancients were not perfect in recognizing cognate words and Theophrastus will not have been an exception.

An example of mistaken etymology may be found in Porphyrius’ excerpts from Theophrastus’ work *On Piety*. There we read that “The ancients were so concerned with not transgressing custom that they cursed, ἀρασσάμενους, those who departed from the old way and introduced another, and they called accursed, ἀρώματα, what is burned (on alters) today” (584A.19–22). Here we are given to understand that the verb ἀράσθαι and the noun ἄρωμα are cognate words, which is quite wrong. If that is Theophrastus’ considered view, then he is in error. But I have my doubts, and in the text-translation volumes we commented in a footnote, “There is a play on words here. The Greek ἄρωμα means ‘spice’, but in this passage it is used as if derived from ἀράσθαι meaning to ‘curse’” (vol. 2 p. 407 fn. 1). The operative phrase is “a play on words.” If Theophrastus’ work was an exoteric work and a dialogue,

⁵⁵ For discussion of piety as a mean disposition, see my article “Theophrastus: Piety, Justice and Animals” in *Theophrastean Studies* (2003) pp. 189–191.

⁵⁶ See 584A.93–94 with *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 571–575.

as I think it was,⁵⁷ then we should leave open the possibility that on occasion Theophrastus was playing with words.⁵⁸

In text 730, the Scholiast makes explicit reference to *On Discoveries* and goes on to speak of a time before men, ἄνθρωποι, i.e., mankind learned to grind grain. We are not told who was first to discover a method of grinding corn, and almost certainly Theophrastus did not think that he could name the responsible individual. We may compare 584A.29–35, where Theophrastus first speaks of the race of men, τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, and then continues using plural verbs (understand ἄνθρωποι). In both texts, 730 and 584A, Theophrastus is dealing with prehistory. In some contexts, that does not rule out introducing a mythical figure (e.g. the Titan Prometheus [729.1]) or a shadowy figure whose name exists in local lore (e.g. the Corinthian Hyperbius [734.2]). But in the case before us, there is no compelling reason to think that Theophrastus himself created a quasi-historical figure, in order to give a name to the inventor of the grinder.

731 Pliny, *Natural History* 7.197 (CB vol. 7 p. 114.12–14 Schilling)

732 Pliny, *Natural History* 7.195–196 (CB vol. 7 p. 114.2–5 Schilling)

733 Pliny, *Natural History* 7.205 (CB vol. 7 p. 118.16–18 Schilling)

Literature: Wendling 1891 p. 7; Robert (1909) col. 880–881; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; Lippold (1952) col. 1635; Kennedy (1957) pp. 99–100; Schwartz (1960) pp. 246–248; Thraede (1962) col. 1210, 1231; Locher (1986) pp. 27–28; Koch (2000) p. 65, 221; Schilling (2003) p. 239, 253; Beagon (2005) pp. 426–431, 451–452; Fortenbaugh (2005) p. 232, 295; Sharples (2005) pp. 57–59; Hoesch (2007) col. 523–524

The three texts 731, 732 and 733 all occur toward the end of Book 7 of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*. Pliny appears to have finished his "anthropology," i.e., his discussion of mankind *qua* nature's highest creation (see above, Chapter II, "The Sources" no. 2) and now adds a brief discussion of inventions and inventors, in which the three Theophrastean texts are found. Pliny's mode of expression in introducing the discussion of inventions is

⁵⁷ For brief remarks, see *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 70–71 with n. 210.

⁵⁸ We may compare Plato's *Cratylus*, a dialogue in which bad etymologies abound. Plato will have known that and yet he chose to introduce them. The great Jowett, rarely cited today, is on target when he asserts that most of the etymologies in the *Cratylus* are "ridiculously bad," and then asks whether Plato has been "amusing himself by writing a comedy in the form of a prose dialogue."

suggestive of an afterthought,⁵⁹ but the discussion may be said to continue and strengthen the idea of man's superior position within nature.⁶⁰ That said, the discussion is noticeably condensed and gives the impression of a loosely organized epitome of one or more previously existing discussions of "firsts."⁶¹ I shall address the texts in the order in which they appear in Pliny: i.e., 7.195–196 = 732 will be discussed before 7.197 = 731 and 7.205 = 733. Printing 7.197 before 7.195–196, as we did in the text-translation volumes, now seems to me gratuitous and a lapse on our part as editors.⁶²

Text 732 occurs within a list of discoveries/inventions that relate closely to the establishment of communities (7.194–195). In what precedes, we are told that men lived in caves until houses made of brick were invented; that the first town (in Greece) was Cecropia or Argos or Sicyon; that the Egyptians date their town of Diospolis much earlier (7.194); that tiles, mining copper and various tools were invented on the island of Cyprus; and that wells came to Greece from Egypt. What follows is text 732: *lapicidinas Cadmus Thebis, aut ut Theophrastus in Phoenice; Thrason muros; turres ut Aristoteles Cyclopes, Tirynthii ut Theophrastus. Aegyptii textilia, inficere lanas Sardibus Lydi*, "Stone-quaries (were invented) by Cadmus at Thebes, or as Theophrastus says, in Phoenicia; Thrason (invented) walls; towers (were invented) by the Cyclopes according to Aristotle, by the people of Tiryns according to Theophrastus. The Egyptians (invented) woven fabrics, the Lydians at Sardis⁶³ the dyeing of wool" (7.195–196).

I have altered the translation printed in the text-translation volumes by removing "and" after "Thrason (invented) walls" and inserting a semi-colon in its place. In the Latin text, the comma after *Thrason muros* (line 2) has been replaced with a semi-colon. That agrees with the Budé edition and separates more clearly the report concerning walls from the subsequent report concerning towers. To be sure, walls relate closely to towers in that both are constructed out of stone, and together walls and towers can protect a town or city when attacked. But the transmitted text does not make that connection and does not suggest that the subsequent mention of Aristotle

⁵⁹ The opening sentence of 7.191 is quoted above, Chapter II "The Sources no. 2."

⁶⁰ Beagon (2005) p. 56, 416.

⁶¹ See above, Chapter II "The Sources" no. 2.

⁶² Tempting as it may be, I do not recommend renumbering, so that 731 becomes 732 and 732 becomes 731. That would only create difficulties for scholars working with the first edition (1992) or that edition with corrections (1993).

⁶³ The plural noun *Sardes* refers to the chief city in Lydia, commonly called "Sardis" in English.

as source for a report concerning towers should be taken together with the report concerning walls. The words *Thrason muros* should be viewed as self-contained: a basic report concerning invention, i.e., who (invented) what.⁶⁴ Who exactly Thrason was cannot be said. No other text refers to him.⁶⁵

The final sentence of 732 is a report concerning the invention of woven fabrics and the dyeing of wool (line 4).⁶⁶ It is followed by remarks concerning the spindle, thread and nets, the fuller's art and shoemaking. These subsequent remarks are not printed as part of 732. Why, then, has the sentence concerning woven fabrics and dyeing wool been printed? There is no good answer. The focus has turned to clothing and there is no obvious connection with Theophrastus.⁶⁷ Of course, the final sentence may be said to indicate what follows (i.e., context material), but then why not print one or more of the sentences that precede 732 (also context material)? In a new edition of the fragments, the final sentence should be omitted.⁶⁸

The opening sentence of 732 says, "Stone-quarries (were invented) by Cadmus at Thebes, or as Theophrastus says, in Phoenicia" (line 1). No authority is named for the first alternative, i.e., at Thebes. Failure to mention an authority is not unusual in Pliny's catalogue of inventions. The conjunction "or" (*aut*) suggests disagreement between Theophrastus, who places

⁶⁴ Picking out walls for special mention, is not surprising. It reflects the longstanding realization that towns lacking walls are vulnerable, whereas those with walls are more secure. See, e.g., Thucydides, *Histories* 1.2.2, 5.1, 7.1, 8.3.

⁶⁵ The name Thrason, Θράσων, suggests someone who is bold, θρασύς. In New Comedy, Thrason is the name of a braggart soldier. See W. Pape and G. Bensler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* vol. 1 p. 518 col. 1 no. 8. Nevertheless, Thrason is also the proper name of real persons. In *Paulys Realencyclopädie* zweiter Reihe Bd. 6 (1937) col. 563 Thrason, the inventor of walls, is no. 5 in a list of 8.

⁶⁶ The Latin word (noun) for wool is *lana*. In the final sentence of 732 (= the first sentence of 7.196), *lana* occurs in the plural: *inficere lanas Sardibus Lydi*, "the Lydians at Sardis (invented) the dyeing of wool." Both *lana* and "wool" are mass words (there is no limit to the amount of wool that can be piled up without becoming two or more wools), and in English it would be odd to translate *inficere lanas* with "the dyeing of wools" (plural). One is tempted to construe *lanas* as a reference to batches or pieces of wool. But Latin usage may be more forgiving. At least the poet Ovid can write *lanas tingere murice*, "to soak/dye wool a purple color" (*Metamorphoses* 6.9, cf. 4.34).

⁶⁷ Hyginus, *Myths* 274.17 (ed. Rose [1963] p. 168.2 = ed. Marshall² [2002] p. 197.47–48) attributes both dyeing wool and woven fabric to the Lydians without mentioning Theophrastus. Cf. Schilling (2003) p. 239 and Sharples (2005) p. 58.

⁶⁸ In the Loeb edition, the section number 196 has been misplaced, so that the final sentence of 732 is the final sentence of section 196. It is conceivable that the misplaced section number led us to include the final sentence (that would be completing the section), but I am reluctant to embrace such an explanation.

the invention of quarries in Phoenicia, and unnamed persons who locate the invention in Thebes.⁶⁹ Construed as a unique event, an invention can only occur in one place: hence, either Thebes or Phoenicia. But the disagreement may be more apparent than real. Cadmus is the mythological son of Agenor, the king of Tyre on the Phoenician coast. He is also the mythological founder of Thebes in Boeotia. Perhaps Cadmus invented stone-quarries in Phoenicia and brought the practice to Greece. We may compare Cadmus' role in bringing the alphabet from Phoenicia to Greece.⁷⁰ Or perhaps Cadmus invented the stone-quarry in Thebes and in some work, e.g., *On Discoveries*, Theophrastus referred to Cadmus as a Phoenician, which Pliny or his source construed as a reference to the place in which the invention occurred. Or should we understand the reference to Thebes not as a reference to Thebes in Boeotia but as reference to Thebes in Egypt. The latter was known for its limestone quarries, and we can imagine Phoenicia functioning as a midway station through which Cadmus brought quarrying to Greece.⁷¹ But all that is speculation. Moreover and more importantly, Cadmus is a mythological figure, and as such his deeds were subject to retelling with variation according to context.

After the reference to Thrason as the inventor of walls, Pliny introduces towers and reports the views of Aristotle's and Theophrastus: the former identified the Cyclopes as the inventor of towers, while the latter named the Tirynthians (lines 2–3). Now Theophrastus has, as it were, a named opponent, his teacher Aristotle. That might excite more interest, especially if we see here evidence of Theophrastus' readiness to go his own way. But again attention to mythology is important. In *Theogony* 139–146, Hesiod tells of three Cyclopes: Brontes, Steropes and Arges, who were the sons of Heaven and Earth, and exhibited strength and craft in their works. According to Callimachus, *Hymn* 3 (*To Artemis*) 46–50, they were Hephaestus' workmen, and according to a scholium on Euripides *Orestes* 965, they built the fortifications of Tiryns. (See also Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 2.25.8 and

⁶⁹ Wendling p. 7 thinks it highly likely that Aristotle's name has fallen out (line 1) and that the opposition is between Theophrastus and his teacher. That is, of course, possible, and it finds some support in the fact that Aristotle and Theophrastus are opposed in what follows regarding towers (lines 2–3), but in between comes Thrason regarding walls (line 2). I prefer to leave unidentified the persons who said that Cadmus invented stone-quarries.

⁷⁰ See *Natural History* 7.192, where Pliny reports that Cadmus brought 16 letters to Greece from Phoenicia.

⁷¹ See Beagon (2005) pp. 427–428, who observes that Cadmus had links with Egypt as well as Phoenicia, and that in *On Stones* 1.6 Theophrastus mentions quarries in Thebes which are usually understood as quarries in Egyptian Thebes.

Strabo, Geography 8.6.10–11). Apparently the two Peripatetics are not true opponents. Or more cautiously, the opposition between the two can be mitigated. Both have the same towers and city in mind: one names the Cyclopes, while the other refers to the Tirynthians, whose city the Cyclopes fortified. We need only understand that these fortifications involved towers, which were first erected (invented) in Tiryns by the Cyclopes.⁷²

Text 731 follows closely on 732.⁷³ It is quite short, being only one sentence long. In order to facilitate discussion, I print it here together with the immediately following sentence added: *aes conflare et temperare Aristoteles Lydum Scythen monstrasse, Theophrastus Delam Phrygem putant; aerarium fabricam alii Chalybas alii Cyclopas* “Aristotle thinks that Scythes the Lydian showed how to fuse and alloy bronze, Theophrastus that Delas the Phrygian (did so). The manufacture of bronze some (attribute) to the Chalybes, others to the Cyclopes.”⁷⁴ The translation of the first sentence is that found in the text-translation volumes. It is problematic. The noun *aes* might have been translated with “copper,” but we chose to translate with “bronze,” for the two verbs, *conflare* and *temperare*, taken together suggested to us that Pliny is not referring to melting copper *simpliciter* but rather to combining copper and tin in due proportion in order to make the alloy bronze. Difficulty arises when one asks how the second sentence relates to the first. If it is focused on the manufacture of bronze, then do we have four candidates: two from each sentence for a total of four, each of the four having been picked out by one or more authorities as the first person to manufacture bronze? Or is the first sentence focused on copper and not bronze? Hence the translation of Beagon: “Aristotle thinks that the melting and working of copper was first demonstrated by Scythes the Lydian.”⁷⁵ I leave the matter open, though my inclination is to agree with Beagon and other translators like Rackham (Loeb 1942) and Schilling (Budé 2003), who make copper the focus of the first sentence.

⁷² Prehistoric Tiryns was an important, well-fortified city. In the *Iliad* within the “Catalogue of Ships,” Homer describes Tiryns as walled (2.559). Over time the Tirynthians were unable to maintain their position with the Peloponnesus and became the butt of jokes. See text 709 and *Commentary* 8 (2005) pp. 368–369.

⁷³ Between the two texts, the focus is on clothing, medicine and botany (7.196).

⁷⁴ That is the beginning of 7.197, after which we hear of discoveries involving other metals: iron, silver, gold and tin.

⁷⁵ Beagon (2005) p. 102. Aside from “Scythes the Lydian,” her translation is essentially the same as that of Rackham in the Loeb edition of 1942. See, too, that of Schilling in the Budé edition (2003).

A different concern is how to understand the phrase *Lydum Scythen* (line 1). Clearly the phrase is not referring to Scythes the son of Jupiter, to whom Pliny refers later in Book 7 (at 201). Rather, the problem is how to read the phrase: it is possible to construe *Lydum Scythen* as a reference to Lydus the Scythian (Rackham) and not to Scythes the Lydian (Schilling, Beagon). But that reading of the text would have Aristotle referring an important first in metallurgy (the origin of smelting copper) to a northern region above Lydia and Phrygia. That is unlikely, for Asia Minor, including Lydia and Phrygia, was early on an important region in regard to metalworking.⁷⁶ The same cannot be said of Scythia. That might be thought to settle the matter, but before signing on, we should look briefly at a related passage in Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.16 75.4: Δέλας δὲ ἄλλος Ἰδαῖος εὗρε χαλκοῦ κράσιν, ὡς δὲ Ἡσίοδος, Σκύθης. Ferguson translates, “Delas, another (person) from Ida,⁷⁷ found the alloy of bronze, but according to Hesiod, he was a Scythian.”⁷⁸ Here Delas is referred to as an Idaean and not as a Phrygian, and on Ferguson’s translation, reference is made to Scythia north of Asia Minor (more precisely, Delas is called a Scythian). But here Hesiod is named⁷⁹ and not Aristotle as in 731. The scholium is most likely confused, as is Pliny when he tells us that Hesiod attributed the forging of iron to the Idaean Dactyls on Crete (Natural History 7.197, following closely on 731).⁸⁰ Be that as it may, Ferguson’s translation is not necessary. We can construe Σκύθης as a proper name, so that here as in 731 there is no reference to lands north of Lydia and Phrygia, i.e., to Scythia. In addition, describing Delas as an Idaean (Clement) is not incompatible with describing him as a Phrygian (Theophrastus [731]). To be an Idaean, one needed only to reside in the region of Mount Ida, which was understood to be

⁷⁶ See Beagon (2005) p. 430 and above, Chapter II “The Sources” no. 2 on Pliny the Elder *ad fin.*

⁷⁷ In what immediately precedes, we are told that the Idaean Dactyls Celmis and Damnameneus were the first to discover iron on Cyprus. The two Idaean Dactyls are mentioned together with Acmon in a scholion on Apollonius’ *Argonautica* 1.1129–1130, where they are described as Phrygians. See Chapter II no. 2 *ad fin.*

⁷⁸ J. Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, Books One to Three* (Washington DC: The Catholic University 1991) p. 80. In Rose’s collection of Aristotelian fragments (³1886) p. 366, the text of Clement is printed under Pliny *NH* 1.197 = fr. 602.

⁷⁹ The text of Clement is Hesiod fr. 176b Rzach (Teubner 1958) pp. 199–200 = fr. 282 Merkelbach-West (Oxford 1967) p. 142.

⁸⁰ The text of Pliny is Hesiod fr. 176a Rzach = fr. 282 Merkelbach-West. See Schwartz p. 247: “dans la phrase de Pline ‘ferrum Hesiodus in Creta eos qui vocati Dactyli Idaei’ faut-il supprimer ‘in Creta,’” with n. 4 “L’erreur est certainement imputable à Pline.”

part of Phrygia.⁸¹ I conclude therefore that what Clement reports need not be read in such a way that it contradicts the proposed interpretation of 731.⁸²

In discussing 732, I suggested that whereas Aristotle and Theophrastus appeared to offer opposing views, they were not in fact true opponents. Can the same be said of 731? Two different men are named, Scythes and Delas, as are two different regions, Lydia and Phrygia. Should we say that here at least there is disagreement between teacher and student. That is tempting, especially if we focus on the verb *putant*, “they think,” and take the verb to mean that the views reported are the considered opinions of Aristotle and Theophrastus. But that need not be the case. Most likely Pliny is drawing directly or indirectly on an earlier collection of discoveries/inventions, in which Aristotle and Theophrastus were cited as sources for differing reports concerning the origins of metallurgy. The two Peripatetics may have regarded these reports as traditional beliefs (local lore and the like) that circulated side by side with competing beliefs. Perhaps they preferred one belief over another, but it does not follow that they embraced it as their own considered opinion.⁸³ Moreover, compilers of collections are not always interested in such fine distinctions. And when the reports are those of distinguished philosophers, a compiler might consciously or unconsciously add punch to his collection by transforming the reports into views or beliefs: what the distinguished philosophers think, *putant*, or hold to be fact.

Text 733 (7.205) does not follow closely on text 731 (7.197). In between a considerable number of firsts are listed: those concerned with metals, pottery, woodworking, measures and fire (197–198), vehicles, commerce, oil and honey (199), forms of government (200), weapons and methods of war (200–202), divination, astronomy (203), music (204), poetry, prose and athletic games (205).⁸⁴ At this point comes text 733 on the introduction of painting (end 205), after which the focus turns to boating (206–209). The list

⁸¹ See, e.g., Strabo, *Geography* 10.3.22, where we are told that the term “Phrygia” came to be used for the Troad, because after the sack of Troy the Phrygians gained control of the region.

⁸² For completeness’ sake, I mention that G. Knaack, “Studien zu Hyginus,” *Hermes* 16 (1881) p. 587 n. 1, citing Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5.650, wanted to change “Lydus” to “Lyncus.” To my knowledge, the change has found no acceptance.

⁸³ I am not arguing with the *general* idea that collections of firsts presupposed that there can be only one first: one inventor at one time in one place (see above Chapter III “Titles of Books” no. 11). Rather I am focused on Peripatetics like Aristotle and Theophrastus, who will have recognized competing traditions and will not have felt obligated always to embrace a single tradition as true.

⁸⁴ The list is incomplete and lacks detail, but it is representative.

exhibits a measure of coherence, but there are surprises: e.g., the mention of a four-wheeled vehicle between fire and the growing of vines (197–198).⁸⁵

Text 733 runs as follows: *picturam Aegyptii et in Graecia Euchir Daedali cognatus ut Aristoteli placet, ut Theophrasto Polygnotus Atheniensis*, “Painting was originated by the Egyptians, and in Greece by Euchir the kinsman of Daedalus as Aristotle thinks, but by Polygnotus the Athenian according to Theophrastus.”⁸⁶ The translation is that found in the text-translation volumes. A verb has been supplied: “was originated,” and the three nominatives, *Aegyptii*, *Euchir* and *Polygnotus*, have been rendered by prepositional phrases beginning with “by.” That is not wrong, but it may obscure the fact that Pliny’s text is condensed through the omission of a verb. The omission is common elsewhere in the *Natural History* and occurs throughout the immediately preceding list of athletic contests. We might understand the verb *instituere*⁸⁷ and translate with the English verb “to institute” as Beagon does.⁸⁸ Also supplied is the conjunction “but” between the phrase referring to Aristotle and that referring to Theophrastus. Later I shall suggest that introducing “but” is a mistake, for it suggests disagreement between Aristotle and Theophrastus.

Coming immediately after athletic contests, the introduction of painting may appear awkwardly placed. Better might be after music, poetry and prose (203–205). That said, we should recognize that athletic contests were part of Greek culture broadly construed and that there were contests in painting as well as in athletics, drama and music. On painting, see Pliny’s primary discussion of painting in Book 35 of *Natural History*. There we read that when the painter Panaenus flourished (mid-fifth century), contests in painting were established in Corinth and Delphi. Panaenus is said to have been the first to compete and to have been defeated by Timagoras at the Pythian games (35.58). We are also told that Parrhasius (early fourth century) competed with Zeuxis, who yielded the prize to him (35.65) and that on another occasion Parrhasius was defeated by Timanthes in a contest in which the subject matter was Ajax and the arms of Achilles (35.72). The latter occasion is of some interest for there are competing versions concerning

⁸⁵ On oddities in the beginning of Pliny’s catalogue, see Chapter II “The Sources” no. 2.

⁸⁶ Text 733 is no. 380 in J. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig: Engelmann 1868) p. 68.

⁸⁷ The verb *instituere* occurs earlier in 7.204 and 205 where it governs an infinitive. In 733 it would govern the accusative *picturam*.

⁸⁸ At the end of 7.204 and earlier in 205, Beagon p. 104 translates *instituere* with “to institute.” In our text 733, she supplies “introduced.”

Parrhasius' reaction to defeat. According to Aelian, *Miscellaneous Histories* 9.11 and Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 12.62, who cite Theophrastus as their source, Parrhasius accepted defeat in a gracious manner, saying that he cared little about the defeat but sympathized with the son of Telamon, who was now defeated for the second time (552A–B). In contrast, Pliny records a version less favorable to Parrhasius. Instead of expressing disinterest in his own defeat, Parrhasius used to say in the name of his hero that he was annoyed at having been defeated for a second time by an unworthy opponent, *ab indigno* (35.72). Given Pliny's wide reading and copious note taking, he is likely to have known both versions. Why he preferred one to the other is a question I leave to others. See *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics pp. 645–648 on 552A–B.

In 733 we are told first that the Egyptians originated painting (line 1). That is not surprising, since the antiquity of the Egyptian civilization was well known.⁸⁹ It should, however, be noted that in *Natural History* 35, Pliny is cautious. He says that the question concerning the origin of painting is uncertain and does not belong to the plan of his work. Pliny recognizes that the Egyptians claim to have originated painting six thousand years before it arrived in Greece, but he declares their claim to be patently empty (35.15). As for the Greeks, Pliny says that some of them place the origins of painting in Sicyon and others in Corinth. In what follows, Pliny reports that line-drawing was invented either by the Egyptian Philocles or by the Corinthian Cleanthes (35.16). It is probably best to stay with Pliny's initial assessment of the issue: the origin of painting is uncertain.⁹⁰

In 733 Pliny disposes of the Egyptians in two words: *picturam Aegyptii*. He exhibits no interest in details, and his source may have been equally disinterested. Be that as it may, what follows concerning Greece includes more details but only a few: Euchir and Polygnotus are named, Greece and Athens are referred to, Aristotle and Theophrastus are cited as sources. There are problems here that ought not to be overlooked. I mention three. First, describing Polygnotus as an Athenian, *Atheniensis* (line 2), seems quite wrong. We might have expected Polygnotus to be described as a Thasian, *Thasius*, for he hailed from the island of Thasos (35.58). A possible explanation is that abbreviation (most likely on the part of an intermediary)

⁸⁹ See, e.g., 584A.1–5.

⁹⁰ Beagon (2005) p. 451 is more positive but still cautious: "Overall, he (Pliny) places the origins of painting in Corinth or Sicyon."

resulted in confusing Polygnotus' work in Athens with his place of origin.⁹¹ A different and in my judgment a more likely explanation is that the description "Athenian" reflects the fact that the Athenians granted Polygnotus citizenship for his artistic contributions to civic life. His work without fee on the so-called Painted Portico immediately comes to mind (Pliny 35.58; Plutarch, *Life of Cimon* 4.6), but other accomplishments may have played a role (Harpocration, *Lexicon of the Ten Orators*, s.v. Πολύγνωτος [vol. 1 p. 254.5–8 Dindorf]).⁹²

The second problem is how we are to understand the assertion that Polygnotus instituted painting in Athens. The idea that Polygnotus was the first person to bring painting to Greece and more specifically to the city of Athens is so absurd that it can be dismissed without discussion. Certainly Theophrastus would never have accepted the idea, and it is difficult to imagine him reporting the idea as a wrongheaded tradition concerning the period following the Persian Wars.⁹³ There is, however, a different way to understand the assertion that Polygnotus instituted painting; it is provided by Pliny himself in Book 35 of his *Natural History*. There we read that it was Polynotus, who first, *primus*, depicted women in transparent garments and colored headdress, and who first, *primus*, contributed to the art of painting by depicting the mouth open with teeth exposed and by varying facial expression (35.58),⁹⁴ Apparently Polygnotus was recognized as an innovator, who discovered/invented new techniques that transformed painting as it was practiced in his day.⁹⁵ From that perspective, he could be said to have instituted painting in Athens, not as the first person to produce a picture but as a person who established a new form of painting.⁹⁶

⁹¹ In the Budé edition p. 118, Schilling avoids the problem by translating *Atheniensis* with "à l'Athénien," but that is a mistranslation.

⁹² See Koch p. 65 with n. 18, who points out that in Book 7.205 Pliny refers to Polygnotus as an Athenian and in Book 35.58 as a Thasian.

⁹³ Polygnotus worked in Athens after the Persian Wars, c. 480–440 BC (Hoesch col. 523).

⁹⁴ Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, in which we read that Polygnotus' figures express character (6 1450a27–28) and that this character is better than ours (2 1448a5–6).

⁹⁵ Art historians do not ignore the innovations of Polygnotus. For brief remarks, see, e.g., R.M. Cook, *Greek Art: Its Development, Character and Influence* (New York: Farrar-Straus-Giroux 1972) pp. 62–63, and for fuller discussion see, e.g., M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* vol. 1 (Cambridge: University Press 1975) pp. 240–270 and Koch 133–136, 181, 203–205, 207–208, 214, 218–226.

⁹⁶ We may compare Hyperbius *qua* discoverer of the potter's wheel. If he is credited with inventing the kick wheel, then he might be credited with so improving (transforming, perfecting) the original/basic potter's wheel that it is appropriate to speak of Hyperbius as the inventor of the wheel. (That is not to say that the kick wheel immediately replaced the

The third problem is one of our own making. When we translated the words *in Graecia Euchir Daedali cognatus ut Aristoteli placet, ut Theophrasto Polygnotus Atheniensis*, we inserted a “but” between *ut Aristoteli placet* and *ut Theophrasto*, thereby creating the appearance of disagreement between Aristotle and Theophrastus: “as Aristotle thinks” vs “as Theophrastus (thinks).”⁹⁷ Whereas Aristotle credited Eucir,⁹⁸ a creature of folklore and a relative of Daedalus,⁹⁹ with introducing painting in Greece, Theophrastus credited Polygnotus, a historical figure who lived in the 5th century BC. So understood there is a stark contrast between the views of the two Peripatetics, but the contrast is unreal. The Latin text exhibits no *sed* between the phrases in question, and none is wanted.¹⁰⁰ What we have is the awkward juxtaposition of two non-competing attributions. Aristotle named Euxir as the first to introduce painting in Greece and Theophrastus named Polygnotus for introducing innovations that changed painting for the better. We can criticize the juxtaposition as harsh and confusing, but it belongs to collections of discoveries that were put together over time by collectors who searched the literature for innovations and added what they found. Material from different sources found their place next to each other, which on occasion created a false impression of disagreement. That might explain the awkwardness involved in 733, but it is no more than a guess.

According to Wendling, when Pliny cites both Aristotle and Theophrastus, as in 731–733, we are not to conclude that Pliny is reporting what he has

original wheel. It did not.) See above, the introduction to this chapter p.138 n. 9 on Diogenes Laetius, *Lives* 3.48 and below p. 172 n. 111 on horse's bit.

⁹⁷ I take the phrase *in Graecia* with both Euchir and Polygnotus; otherwise there is no disagreement between Aristotle and Theophrastus. In the text-translation volumes, we varied the translation of *ut placet*: first “as Aristotle thinks” and then “according to Theophrastus.” That seems to me wrong, for when the same translation is used it encourages the reader to ask how the two attributions might be related, if at all.

⁹⁸ The name “Euchir” refers to good hands, dexterity. It involves bringing together the Greek adverb εὖ and the noun χεῖρ. Robert col. 881 thinks it likely that the Euchir in question is identical with Euchir of Corinth, who along with Diopus and Eugrammus introduced modeling with clay to Italy (Pliny *NH* 35.152). I am not inclined to follow Robert and note that he fails to distinguish between Aristotle and Theophrastus in regard to Euchir the founder of painting.

⁹⁹ Daedalus is associated with sculpture as well as modeling in clay (see 34.76, where Daedalus is credited with a work in which two boys are using scrapers on their bodies), so that making a relative, *cognatus*, the originator of painting in Greece is a natural fabrication. In the commentary to 734, a different relative of Daedalus is mentioned, namely, his nephew Talus, who is credited with inventing the potter's wheel (Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History* 4.76).

¹⁰⁰ Beagon p. 104 adds “and,” which is preferable to “but.” My own preference is to separate the clauses with a comma.

gleaned by consulting both the writings of Aristotle and those of Theophrastus. Rather, 1) Pliny has his information from an earlier writer who has diligently brought together what the two Peripatetics said, or 2) Pliny has the information from a work of Theophrastus, who cites Aristotle when he disagrees with him, or 3) Pliny cites a work of Aristotle that has been edited by Theophrastus, who adds his own opinions to those of his teacher. Wendling finds the first possibility unlikely and prefers the third.¹⁰¹ Applied to 733, we can say that Wendling prefers to think of Theophrastus not only editing a work of Aristotle, in which Aristotle expresses an opinion concerning the origin of painting, but also adding his own view which differs from Aristotle. That is possible, but it is also (highly) speculative.

Picking up on Wendling's remarks and focusing on the way in which ancient authors cite their sources, Sharples tells us that when an author C reports that one person A said one thing and another person B said something else, then what C reports "often" comes entirely from B. And "in the common ancient fashion," B names A only when he disagrees with A. Otherwise, he feels free to report what A says without attribution. Applied to 733, we have Pliny = C reporting what Theophrastus = B said, and that includes not only Theophrastus' own view concerning Polygnotus, but also Aristotle's view concerning Euchir and the Egyptians. In the case of Euchir, Theophrastus named Aristotle because he disagreed with his teacher, but in the case of the Egyptians he did not name Aristotle because he was in agreement. That is interesting speculation, but it is not clear that the line of reasoning outlined by Sharples applies here, and he is careful to say so: "if that applies here" and "if so."¹⁰² The relevant texts of Theophrastus and Aristotle have been lost, so that it is quite impossible to be certain that Pliny or his source has drawn entirely on Theophrastus, i.e., that Pliny or his source did not consult Aristotle directly and inspect still another source that focused on the Egyptians. Moreover and more importantly, however appealing it may be to detect controversy between the two Peripatetics, I doubt that 733 should be viewed as a sign of genuine controversy. If it is true, as argued above, that Polygnotus is cited for developing/inventing a

¹⁰¹ Wendling p. 7.

¹⁰² In setting forth the general line of reasoning, Sharples (2005) p. 59 tells us that when author C says that A said one thing and B another, it is a "reasonable assumption" that C's knowledge of A comes from B. In other words, the general line of reasoning may hold for the most part, but it does not hold in all cases. Hence, in regard to 733, Sharples is careful to add the qualifiers: "if" and "if so." (The sentence introduced by "if so," is marred by an unwanted "we," but the qualification is clear.)

much improved form of painting, then the idea of controversy disappears, for Aristotle is referring to a mythological past when painting first came into being, while Theophrastus is reporting on a much later development. Only the most naïve compiler would see in 733 a true opposition between the two Peripatetics. And the same holds for the educated reader.

Although text 733 names Theophrastus, no work is cited. Kennedy (1957) pp. 99–100¹⁰³ suggests *On Style*, in which differences in literary style will have been compared with differences in artistic style. The discussion of style will not have been historical in orientation and the reference to Polygnotus will have been parenthetical. That is possible, but it seems more plausible to think of *On Inventions*, which was two books or scrolls long and was focused on firsts. It is tempting to think that reference was made to Polygnotus as the first painter to depict women in transparent garments and to show a person's teeth (see above), but 733 does not say that. I leave further speculation to others.¹⁰⁴

734 Scholium on Pindar's *Olympian Ode* 13.27 = 20¹⁰⁵ (c, *BT* vol. 1 p. 362.23–363.1 Drachmann)

Literature: Jacoby (1926) vol. 2A p. 55 and vol. 2C p. 52; Kleingünther (1933) pp. 150–151 n. 128, 135; Rieth (1939) pp. 67–68; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; Thraede (1962) col. 1210; Sharples (2005) p. 57; Zhmud (2006) p. 42

Text 734 is a scholium on Pindar's *Olympian Ode* 13, which was written to celebrate the double victory of Xenophon of Corinth in the Olympic games of 464 BC. Xenophon won both the stadion race and the pentathlon. The stadion race was also one of the five events that made up the pentathlon, which might be thought to diminish to some degree Xenophon's accomplishment, but Pindar neatly counters such an interpretation when he points out that no one before Xenophon had accomplished the feat (43 = 31).

At the opening of the ode, Pindar praises the house of Xenophon, referring to it as three times victor at Olympia. That includes a victory by

¹⁰³ Cf. G. Kennedy, *The Art of persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: University Press 1963) pp. 280–281.

¹⁰⁴ For fuller remarks, I refer to *Commentary* 8 (2005) on rhetoric and poetics p. 232 (n. 207) and 295.

¹⁰⁵ Throughout this comment, I give both the older line number or numbers, which are used by Drachmann in his edition of the scholia, and the newer numbers, which are used in modern editions. The older line numbers are higher, because the editions were based on shorter lines. See, e.g., Dickey (2007) p. 39 n. 23.

Xenophon's father, Thessalus.¹⁰⁶ Pindar then turns to the city of Corinth, which he describes as a city of brilliant young men and the dwelling place of Order, Justice and Peace (4–11 = 4–10). He speaks of the citizens' outstanding achievements in the sacred games (17–20 = 13–16) and then widens the topic to include inventions.¹⁰⁷ He states pithily, ἅπαν εὐρόντος ἔργον, "All credit belongs to the discoverer/inventor" (24 = 17),¹⁰⁸ after which Pindar asks rhetorically, from where, πόθεν, did the charms of Dionysus appear, and who, τίς, added measures/restrainers/bits to the gear of horses, or (who, τίς) added the twin kings of birds to temples (25–31 = 18–22)?¹⁰⁹ The answer is, of course, the Corinthians. As might be expected, the scholiasts did not hesitate to give their own answers to these questions.

The scholium that concerns us occurs in several codices: BCDE and Q, which are explained above in Chapter II "Titles of Books" no. 18 and are clearly marked in Drachmann's edition (no. 27a–c, p. 361.10–363.5). Theophrastus is cited in response to the second question = the first τίς-question: τίς γὰρ ἵππειοις ἐν ἔντεσσιν μέτρα (understand ἐπέθηκε from the second τίς-question). In Drachmann's edition, the reference to Theophrastus does not follow immediately upon the lemma giving Pindar's words. Instead, we are offered nine plus lines from codex B, which do not mention Theophrastus (27a, pp. 36210–6219). What we read divides into two parts. First, we are told that τὰ ἵππεια μέτρα belong to the bridle (used in riding horses) and that it is generally believed that (the horse) Pegasus was first restrained by Bellerophon in Corinth.¹¹⁰ In other words, Pindar's question concerns the bit by which a horse is checked or restrained (LSJ s.v. μέτρον I.5).¹¹¹ Second, this

¹⁰⁶ Thessalus is named later in the ode (48 = 35).

¹⁰⁷ The common thread is being first, πρῶτος, whether in an athletic contest or in regard to some invention or discovery that figures prominently in the advancement of culture and more generally of a comfortable, civilized life. Zhmud (2006) pp. 31–33 well emphasizes the competitive spirit of the ancient Greeks and the value placed on *priority as such* (p. 32).

¹⁰⁸ The translation is that of W. Race, *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes* = Loeb vol. 56 (Cambridge MA: Harvard 1997) p. 191. On occasion, Pindar uses ἔργον for the prize or recognition that results from accomplishment. See *Ol.* 13.38 with LSJ s.v. I.2 and J. Rumpel, *Lexicon Pindaricum* (Stuttgart: Teubner 1883) p. 176 col. 1: *praemia, ut lebetes et tripodes*.

¹⁰⁹ Concerning this question (the third of three and the second τίς-question), see above, Chapter II "The Sources" no. 18 on the Pindaric scholia.

¹¹⁰ The English "generally believed" translates the indefinite third person plural ἀποδεδώκασι followed by τῷ δοκεῖν. On the horse Pegasus, which came into being from the blood of Medusa and which played a role when Bellerophon killed the Chimaera, see Hesiod, *Theogony* 281, 325.

¹¹¹ Gildersleeve (1890) p. 230 comments, "the selection of the word (μέτρα) points to a more perfect control gained by the Corinthian bit, not the out-and-out invention of it," See above the introduction to this Chapter p. 138 n. 9 on changes that are improvements. For clarity's

understanding of Pindar's question is said to have been rejected by Didymus (Chalcenterus¹¹² c. 80–10 BC), who construed the words metaphorically in terms of the potter's wheel. ὁ κεραμεικὸς τροχός. We are told that the wheel is proper to the horse, and in each case (the horse and the potter's wheel) riding/driving is accomplished by the heel of the foot. Callimachus (3rd century BC) is then cited in regard to the use of the heel in riding a horse: πτέρνῃ θ' ἵππος ἐλαυνόμενος (p. 362.18–19). The idea that riders use their heels to spur on a horse hardly needs comment. Also familiar is the idea that potters use their heels to rotate the pots on which they are working. They work with a kick-wheel that is below the wheel on which the pot sits. I return the to kick-wheel later in this comment.

At this point codex B continues, but DEQ and C (for a portion) are also cited by Drachmann, for they agree with B (beginning of 27b, p. 362.19–22). Again the suggestion is that the “the gear of horses” is to be understood in terms of the potter's wheel, “since (a pot) is shaped on a wheel, and the wheel is shared with the chariot of horses.” Now codex B breaks off, but DEQ and C (for a portion) continue (beginning of 27c, p. 362.23–363.1). What we are offered is our text 734: καὶ Θεόφραστος μὲν ἐν Περὶ εὐρημάτων Ὑπερβιον τὸν Κορίνθιον φησιν εὐρηκέναι τὴν τοῦ κεραμεικοῦ τροχοῦ μηχανήν, “And Theophrastus, indeed, in his *On Discoveries*, says that Hyperbius of Corinth discovered the device of the potter's wheel.” Here D breaks off, and CE and Q continue with a brief statement concerning Pindar, which has not been included in 734: μέτρα δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Πίνδαρος, παρόσον ἐν κεραμεικοῖς μετροῦμεν, “and Pindar (calls) it (the potters wheel) measures, in as much as we measure in ceramic (utensils, i.e., pots)” (p. 363.1–2). Since the δέ might be taken to answer the μὲν, which occurs immediately after Θεόφραστος (734.1), it is tempting to say that the Theophrastean material continues in the δέ-clause, but that in my judgment that would be a mistake. The δέ-clause involves a shift in grammar: καὶ Θεόφραστος μὲν ... φησιν introduces indirect discourse, which is not continued in the statement concerning Pindar. Moreover, μὲν occurs in only two codices, D and E. Codex Q reads δέ

sake, I add that the invention of the bit and its improvement in Corinth were preceded by learning to mount a horse. A scholion on Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* 4.272–274 (p. 277.24–278.3 Wendel) cites the Peripatetic Dicaearchus for the report that Sesonchosis was the first person to discover mounting horses: πρῶτὸν φησιν (Δικαίαρχος) αὐτὸν (Σεσόγχωσιν) εὐρηκέναι ἵππων ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβαίνειν. The scholiast adds that others say Oros (Dicaearchus fr. 58 Mirhady, where Σεχόγγωσιν in line 5 is a typo).

¹¹² For the epithet Χαλκέντερος, “of brazen bowels,” see the *Suda*, s.v. χάλκεος (LG vol. 1.4 p. 781.29–782.1 Adler).

and in combination with καί might be preferred. At least Denniston recognizes καὶ ... δέ (separated by one word) as a combination that appears early in Greek prose. The καί indicates that something is added, and the δέ indicates that what is added is distinct from what precedes.¹¹³ That fits 734 well. Whereas the immediately preceding material has connected the potter's wheel with chariots and horses (p. 362.22), 734 focuses on Theophrastus, Hyperbius and the potter's wheel. In addition Denniston seems not to recognize καὶ ... μέν (separated) as proper usage,¹¹⁴ so that reading καὶ ... δέ with one codex against two seems preferable. I conclude, therefore, that the Theophrastean material is fully represented by 734: it tells us only that in *On Discoveries* Theophrastus recognized a Corinthian named Hyperbius as the inventor of the potter's wheel. The scholium comes from an earlier commentary in which the commentator (most likely Didymus¹¹⁵) cited Theophrastus for Hyperbius' invention and for his connection with Corinth. To be sure, Theophrastus was interested in metaphor,¹¹⁶ but no text suggests that he engaged in allegorical interpretation of the *Odes* of Pindar. And even if he did, I doubt that he would have embraced the tortuous reasoning advanced in the scholia on *Olympian Ode* 13.¹¹⁷

A different concern is how to understand the potter's wheel that Hyperbius is credited with inventing. One possibility is that Hyperbius invented the "basic" wheel, on which the potter places his clay and which spins as the potter shapes the clay. The other possibility has already been mentioned above. It is the kick-wheel, which is situated below and connected to the upper wheel by a shaft. It is driven by the potter's heel. The first possibility is chronologically difficult. The basic wheel that carries the potter's clay came into use in Greece c. 2,200 BC, long before the Greeks began to record who did what first.¹¹⁸ To be sure, the Corinthians may have embraced a legend about pre-historic times. Civic pride is creative. But if the Corinthians did accept Hyperbius as the inventor of the basic wheel, they must have known that

¹¹³ J. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon 1950) pp. 199–203.

¹¹⁴ Denniston p. 391.

¹¹⁵ See below with n. 128.

¹¹⁶ See texts 683, 689A–B, 690 and Appendix 9 with Commentary 8 (2005) on rhetoric and poetics pp. 256–266, 286–292.

¹¹⁷ It is one thing to see in μέτρα a reference to vessels used in measuring quantities, both liquid and solid (cf. p. 363.8–10 Drachmann), and quite another to explain μέτρα in the Pindaric verse in terms of the potter's wheel (p. 362.15).

¹¹⁸ For the date 2200 BC, see G. Richter, *The Craft of the Athenian Potter* (New Haven: Yale 1923) p. 9, 90. Rieth p. 57 says that the potter's wheel came from Crete over the Greek islands to the mainland in the 2nd millennium BC.

there were other candidates: Talos the nephew of Daedalus, who belonged to Athenian folklore,¹¹⁹ and the Scythian Anacharsis, who was often regarded as one of the seven wise men.¹²⁰ Moreover, if the Corinthians knew their Homer well, they will have known that the inventor must predate the poet of the *Iliad* (18.599–601). Oral tradition has a long memory, but it would be a leap of faith to believe that oral tradition had correctly preserved the name Hyperbius. Perhaps, then, we should accept the kick-wheel as the invention attributed to Hyperbius. It is after all mentioned in the scholia that concern us (p. 362.17–18). True, but that mention is found in codex B, whereas the reference to Hyperbius occurs in codices DE and Q (p. 362.23–24). Or is that unimportant, for both the reference to the kick-wheel and the reference to Hyperbius are likely to go back to Didymus Chalcenterus?¹²¹ Be that as it may, it is difficult to tell how important the kick-wheel was in the time of Theophrastus. The illustrations of pot making that survive on Corinthian, Attic and Boeotian vases suggest that the potter employed a slave boy to turn the wheel on which the clay was placed, and the earliest written reference to the kick-wheel dates to the second century BC.¹²² It occurs in *Ecclesiasticus* 38.32, whose author, ben Sira or the son of Sira, wrote c. 190–180, i.e., a century after Theophrastus who died in 286. That does not mean, however, that the kick wheel was invented in the century between Theophrastus and ben Sira. Being a simple device, it may have originated at an earlier date.¹²³ And it may not have originated in Corinth or anywhere else in Greece. I cite Rieth, who places the development of the kick-wheel in Egypt during the Ptolemaic period. In support, he refers to the temple of Osiris on the island of Philae. There on the west wall of the temple, the god Chnum is depicted

¹¹⁹ According to Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History* 4.76, Talus was brought up by Daedalus, and being more talented than Daedalus, he invented the potter's wheel. A different kinsman of Daedalus, Euchir, is mentioned in 733.

¹²⁰ In his *Geography* 7.3.9, Strabo tells us that Ephorus credited Anacharsis with inventing the bellows, the double-fluked anchor and the potter's wheel. In addition, Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 7.198 names Anacharsis as the inventor of the potter's wheel, but allows that others say Hyperbius.

¹²¹ Didymus is named early in the scholium that later refers to the kick-wheel (27a, p. 362.13, 17–18). Although Didymus is not named in the scholium that mentions Hyperbius (27c, p. 363.23), Didymus may well be the source that stands behind what the scholiast says. On Didymus Chalcenterus, see Chapter II "The Sources" no. 18.

¹²² J. Noble, *The Techniques of Painted Attic Pottery* (New York: Watson-Guptill 1965) p. 7 says that "the kick wheel apparently was not used in classical times." B. Sparkes, *Greek Pottery* (Manchester: University Press 1991) p. 15 states without qualification that "there was no kick wheel which the potter could work with his foot; instead the potter had an assistant, a wheel boy."

¹²³ Richter, op. cit. p. 91.

as a potter using his left heel to move a kick-wheel. If Rieth is correct (and I have no reason to doubt him¹²⁴), then it seems clear that the kick-wheel was in use (perhaps invented) in Egypt and will have been known to Didymus Chalcenterus, who worked in Alexandria at the end of the Ptolemaic period. That fits well with what the scholia report, but on its own the depiction of the god Chnum cannot take us back to Theophrastus.

Rather than force a choice between the basic wheel and the kick-wheel, it may be prudent to leave the issue undecided. Hyperbius of Corinth is a murky figure, known to us only as the inventor of the potter's wheel.¹²⁵ In addition, the ancients might refer to improvements as inventions, thereby blurring the line between initial discovery and subsequent modifications for the better.¹²⁶ The potter's wheel fits both categories,¹²⁷ though it is not clear that the ancient artisans who produced pots embraced the kick-wheel as an unqualified improvement. As already mentioned, surviving illustrations on Greek pots show a slave boy turning the wheel on which the pot sits. That may reflect a preference among Greek artisans, for when assisted by a slave, a potter could focus his entire attention and energy on the pot before him and do so at minimal cost.¹²⁸

Finally a word of caution: Although 734 presents an unqualified report concerning what Theophrastus said in *On Discoveries*, we should not assume that Theophrastus endorsed the idea that Hyperbius invented the potter's wheel. The scholiast may have simplified what was stated in his source, and that source may have failed to report words of caution. Moreover, Theophrastus will have known that the invention of the potter's wheel

¹²⁴ Rieth p. 67 n. 1 expresses indebtedness to Dr. Hermann of the Egyptian Department of the Berlin Museum. A line drawing of the depiction of the god Chnum at work is found on p. 67 no. 68a; the use of the heel is clearly depicted.

¹²⁵ Hyperbius of Corinth is referred to not only in the Homeric scholium but also in Pliny's *Natural History* (see above n. 120), and both times he is cited only in reference to the potter's wheel. W. Pape and G. Bensler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* vol. 2 p. 1582 s.v. Hyperbios no. 4 refer to the Pliny passage. In *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 9 (1916) col. 254 Hyperbius is omitted. Caveat: Hyperbius of Corinth is not to be confused with Hyperbius of Athens, who along with his brother Euryalus introduced brick-kilns and houses (Pliny the Elder, *NH* 7.194), and Hyperbius the son of Mars, who is said to have been the first to kill an animal (Pliny 7.209). Schilling (Budé) vol. 7 p. 120, Beagon [2005] p. 105 and others bracket the sentence concerning Hyperbius the son of Mars as occurring out of context and an apparent interpolation. That seems to me wrong. Collections of firsts, including that of Pliny, do not always exhibit a coherent order. See above, Chapter II "The Sources" no. 2.

¹²⁶ An example may be the horse's bit. See above, n. 111.

¹²⁷ I.e., the phrase *καταμεικλὸς τροχός* is ambiguous. It might be used not only of the basic wheel but also of the kick-wheel or the two wheels in combination.

¹²⁸ Richter, *op. cit.* 91.

was attributed to various persons including Talus and Anacharsis. The latter is of especial interest, for according to Strabo, *Geography* 7.3.9, Ephorus attributed the wheel to Anacharsis (FGrH 70 F 42), and Ephorus was Theophrastus' contemporary. It is tempting to believe that Theophrastus and Strato, too (Pliny, *Natural History* 1.7),¹²⁹ anticipated Strabo's criticism of Ephorus¹³⁰ (the potter's wheel is mentioned in Homer's *Iliad* and therefore predates Anacharsis¹³¹), but no text says so explicitly.¹³² Be that as it may, I am inclined to believe that the work *On Discoveries* not only focused on real inventors and serious candidates but also on legendary inventors and the gods as donors. And if that is true, the inclusion of Hyperbius in *On Discoveries* need not mean that Theophrastus viewed him as the true inventor of the potter's wheel. Theophrastus may have included him as a legendary inventor popular in Corinth.

735 Martin of Laon, *Glossary = Greek-Latin Glossary of Laon*: cod. Laon 444, fol. 289^v (Usener, *Kl. Schr.* vol. 1 p. 192)

Literature: Miller (1880) p. 181; Heylbut (1884) p. 158; Wendling (1891) pp. 29–31; Usener, *Kleine Schriften* vol. 1 (1912) p. 192;¹³³ Lutz (1939) pp. 227–228; J. Preaux (1953) p. 456; Stern (1972) pp. 445–447; Sheldon-Williams (1973) p. 3; O'Meara (1988) pp. 16–17; Fortenbaugh (2005) pp. 229–232; Sharples (2005) pp. 61–62

Text 735 is taken from a Greek Latin glossary that has come down to us in a ninth century manuscript, much of which is written in the hand of Martin of Laon. I accept the judgment of those who attribute the glossary to Martin, but there are voices advising caution. (See above, Chapter II “The Sources” no. 10 p. 34 with notes 99 and 100) Our special concern is a report that outlines the development of the Greek alphabet. It begins by stating a source: EX ΠΕΠΛΑΟ ΤΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΙ, “from the *Robe* of Theophrastus” (line 1). The *Robe* is also cited in texts 582 and 736A–C. That Theophrastus himself wrote a work entitled *Robe* is doubtful. It is even more doubtful that such a

¹²⁹ See Chapter 3 “Titles of Books” no. 11.

¹³⁰ Zhmud (2006) p. 42.

¹³¹ Homer, *Iliad* 18.599–601, mentioned above, in regard to the Corinthians. Seneca, *Moral Epistles* 90.31 directs the same argument against Posidonius, who is alleged to have said that Anarchasis invented the potter's wheel (fr. 284.114–118 Edelstein-Kidd).

¹³² Jacoby, FGrH II C p. 52 opposes the idea that Strabo's criticism derives from Peripatetic literature on discoveries. He prefers Homeric scholia and Poseidonioslektüre.

¹³³ Usener's comments on 735 in *Kl. Schr.* vol. 1 p. 192 are an addition to an article that first appeared in *Rheinisches Museum* 25 (1870) pp. 574–616.

work was in circulation in the ninth century, so that it could be consulted at first hand.¹³⁴ That is not to deny that there was a work entitled *Robe*, to which Theophrastus' name was attached. Martin may be drawing on it at first hand, or equally he may be acquainted with it through an intermediary. See Chapter II "Titles of Books" no. 10.

The name "Theophrastus" is followed by an explanation: *proprium et interpretatur deum intelligens*, "a proper name, and interpreted as 'understanding god'" (line 1–2). Stating that "Theophrastus" is a proper noun or name suits a glossary. And while the parts of proper nouns need not be understood in isolation (a man named Armstrong need not have powerful arms), the names of famous men are apt to invite explanation either because the name is thought to fit some distinguished ancestor or because the person being named (the present bearer of the name) does in fact possess or conspicuously fails to possess the attributes suggested by the name. Theophrastus is no exception. Over many centuries, he was reputed to be an outstanding philosopher, speaker and writer, so that we are not surprised to find an explanation of his name in a ninth century manuscript, i.e., codex Laon 444. The same can be said of another ninth century text, namely, John Scotus Eriugena's *Remarks on Martianus Capella*. There we read: *Teofrastus dei expositio vel deum exponens*; θεός *deus*, φράζω *expono*, "Theophrastus (means) setting forth of god or one who sets forth god; *theos* (means) god and *phrazô* (means) I set forth" (9.923 p. 490.20 Dick = 6). The two texts may be said to compliment each other: the man who understands god (735) is the man who can set forth or explain (the nature of) god (6).

Some nine centuries earlier, at the end of the Hellenistic period and the collapse of the Roman Republic, we find Cicero (108–43 BC) exhibiting interest in Theophrastus' name. He connects it with Theophrastus' divine manner of speaking (*Orator* 62 = 5B). That agrees with Cicero's repeated praise of Theophrastus' style (*On the Orator* 1.49 = 51, *Brutus* 121 = 52A, *On Duties* 1.3 = 52B, *On Ends* 1.6 = 50, 1.14 = 54, cf. Plutarch, *Life of Cicero* 24.6 = 53). Cicero is influenced by Theophrastus' exoteric works, whose attractive style need not be doubted. Nevertheless, we should note that when Cicero refers to philosophers' who spoke with eloquence and mentions the tradition according to which Aristotle changed his pupil's name from Tyr-tamus to Theophrastus, Cicero expresses caution: he says, "if Theophrastus acquired his name from his divine manner of speaking" (*Orator* 62 = 5B). The

¹³⁴ Jeaneau p. 6 thinks it not impossible that the *Peplos* was still to be read in the ninth century. I am less optimistic. On the *Peplos*, see Chapter III "Titles of Books" no. 10.

“if” is important, for the idea that Aristotle changed Theophrastus’ name is most likely the creation of a Hellenistic biographer. The name Theophrastus was not uncommon; e.g., indeed, during Theophrastus’ life time two eponymous archons shared the philosopher’s name.¹³⁵ Nevertheless, not long after Cicero, Strabo (c. 63 BC – 19 AD) buys into the tradition: at least he asserts without qualification that Aristotle made the change, thereby avoiding the ugliness of the name Tyrtamus as well as signifying Theophrastus’ keenness for speech, i.e. attractive expression (*Geography* 13.2.4 = 5A). Later Diogenes Laertius (3rd cent.) recorded the name change, stating succinctly that the change was made on account of Theophrastus’ divine manner of speech (*Lives* 5.38 = 1.30–31).

After the explanation of Theophrastus’ name, we are offered an account of the invention of letters, *litterae*. That is clear throughout (lines 3–8) and stated explicitly at the very end: *de inventione litterarum sic accepimus*, “This is what we have received/been told concerning the invention of letters” (line 8). The account itself is quite brief, running only six lines. It divides into five parts, and concludes with the total number of letters that were invented:

- 1) The Egyptians first, *primi*, invented letters.
- 2) Second, *secundi*, the Phoenicians (invented letters), after whom letters are called Phoenician.
- 3) In addition, *autem*, Cadmus of Sidon, the son, *filius*, of Agenor, brought sixteen letters to Greece: ΑΒΓΔΕΙΚΑΜΝΟΠΡΣΤΥ.
- 4) After, *post*, Cadmus, Palamedes, the son, *filius*, of Nauplius invented four letters: ΖΘΧΦ.
- 5) Then, *deinde*, Simonides, the son, *filius*, of Leoprepes, (invented) ΗΞΨΩ.

All (the letters) amount to twenty-four.

We have here a line of development, in which temporal sequence is clearly marked: *primi*, *secundi*, *autem*, *post*, *deinde*. Only *autem* might give pause, but the slightest reflection makes clear that *autem* is not being used as an adversative conjunction; rather, it expresses addition (LS s.v. II), and in context it marks the next step in a process that began in Phoenicia.

¹³⁵ See Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History* 16.77 (Olympiad 110.1 = 340–339 BC) and 19.73 (Olympiad 116.4 = 313–312 BC) and cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dinarchus* 9.

Only human beings are mentioned in 735: the Egyptians¹³⁶ and the Phoenicians are mentioned first and second, then come three individuals: Cadmus, Palamedes and Simonides, each of whom is said to be the son, *filius*, of a named person: Agenor, Nauplius and Leoprepes, respectively (lines 5, 6 and 7). The repetition of *filius*, in combination with the string of temporal markers (first, second, etc.), gives the text a formal (even pedantic) quality. That might be the work of Theophrastus, but equally it might be the work of a later hand. If the *Peplos* is a compilation of Theophrastean material,¹³⁷ then the compiler of the *Peplos* might be responsible, or someone who excerpted material (EX ΠΕΠΛΟ, line 1).

According to 735, the Egyptians first discovered letters, *invenerunt litteras*; second were the Phoenicians, after whom the letters are called Phoenician, *unde Foeniceae litterae dicuntur* (lines 3–4). Assigning the Egyptians pride of place is not surprising, for their civilization was known to be much older than that of the Greeks. What may give pause is the undifferentiated use of “letters,” *litterae* (= Gk. γράμματα), in regard to both the Egyptians and the Phoenicians. Whereas the Egyptians used hieroglyphics, i.e., pictorial symbols, the Phoenicians used “true” letters, i.e., symbols that represent individual sounds and that in combination make up the words used in communication. Aristotle had described true letters as στοιχεῖα, “ultimate elements,” which represent individual sounds and which may be vowels, semi-mutes and mutes (*Poetics* 20 1456b20–22, 25–26). Theophrastus could have done the same, marking off στοιχεῖα from the symbols that are hieroglyphics. If the excerpt preserved in our text involves abridgment, then it seems quite possible that the full Theophrastean text took note of the difference between hieroglyphics and true letters.

It might be objected that treating Egyptian hieroglyphics as forerunners of Greek letters is implausible: the difference between pictorial symbols and Aristotelian στοιχεῖα is simply too great. The objection is not foolish, but the move from hieroglyphics to true letters is intelligible when one focuses on keeping records, i.e., on writing as an aid to memory.¹³⁸ Hieroglyphics serve that purpose as do Aristotelian στοιχεῖα. Moreover, the Greek verb γράφειν

¹³⁶ Persons familiar with Plato's *Phaedrus* might wonder what happened to the Egyptian god Theuth. In the *Phaedrus*, Socrates is made to say that Theuth invented letters, εὐρεῖν γράμματα (274D) as an elixir of memory, μνήμης φάρμακον (274E). True enough, but the god is not to be smuggled into 735. In the Theophrastean text, the focus is entirely on human contributors.

¹³⁷ See above, Chapter III “Titles of Books” no. 10.

¹³⁸ Cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 274E, cited in note two above.

and the cognate noun γράμμα are not narrowly restricted to writing with true letters. In its earliest occurrences, we find the verb used of cutting to the bone in battle and of cutting lines in a tablet that folds (Homer, *Iliad* 17.599 and 6.169, respectively).¹³⁹ Its subsequent use in regard to painting is both common (e.g., Herodotus, *Histories* 2.46) and Theophrastean (552B.7). The noun is used of painted pictures (e.g., Plato, *Republic* 5.17 472D), and Theophrastus refers to the painter Parrhasius as a ζωγράφος, literally “one who paints living creatures” (552A.1). Against this background, it is not surprising to find both hieroglyphics *qua* pictorial symbols¹⁴⁰ referred to as letters, i.e., γράμματα (e.g., Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History* 3.4) and hieroglyphics in meaningful combination referred to as writings, γράμματα (e.g., Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris* 10 354F), which become *litterae* in Latin.

We may compare a passage in Tacitus’ *Annals* (11.14). It runs as follows:

primi per figuras animalium Aegyptii sensus mentis effigebant—ea antiquissima monimenta memoriae humanae inpressa saxis cernuntur—et litterarum semet inventores perhibent; inde Phoenicas, quia mari praepollebant, intulisse Graeciae gloriamque adeptos, tamquam reppererint quae acceperant. Quippe fama est Cadmum classe Phoenicum vectum rudibus adhuc Graecorum populis artis eius auctorem fuisse.

The Egyptians were first to represent the thoughts of the mind through pictures of animals—these oldest documents of human memory (history) are seen (today) impressed on stone—and they (the Egyptians) call themselves

¹³⁹ The use of γράφειν (*re vera*, the participle γράψας) at *Iliad* 6.169 has been the subject of considerable scholarly discussion. Some see a reference to writing: e.g., W. Leaf, who finds it impossible to deny that the lines imply a knowledge of writing in Homeric times (*The Iliad* [London: Macmillan 1886] vol. 1 p. 208) and B. Powell who suggests that Homer does not understand the reference to writing which came to him from the East with the story of Bellerophon (*Writings and the Origins of Greek Literature* [Cambridge: University Press 2002] p. 8). I do not want to deny that the *Iliad* passage concerns communication, but the communication is by grievous marks or signs, σήματα λυγρά (168), which may be only distantly related to the alphabet that concerns us. We may compare a passage in *Iliad* 7, in which the Greek heroes cast lots to determine who will do battle against Hector. We are told that the several participants each marked a lot, κλήρον ἐσημήναντο (175), and when Ajax’s lot came forth, the others did not recognize it. But when it came to Ajax who had inscribed it, ὅς μιν ἐπιγράφας (187), the hero knew it. Here ἐπιγράφειν is used as a synonym for σημαίνειν. The former may be rendered with “inscribe,” but the inscription is unrecognizable to all the participants except Ajax. It is a simple sign cut or scratched on a lot and not a word or name used in communication. In *Iliad* 6, the sign cut or scratched on the tablet is recognizable to (will be understood by) the intended recipient. That might imply a developed system of writing based on syllables, but equally it might be a more primitive mode of communication. In any case, we should not think of Aristotelian στοιχεῖα.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Iliadem pertinentes* 632.52 (vol. 2 p. 272.5 Van der Valk): ζῳδία ἱερογλυφούντες.

the inventors of letters. Thence the Phoenicians, because they were dominant at sea, brought (letters) to Greece and acquired glory, as if they had found what (in fact) they had received. Indeed, the tradition is that Cadmus, having arrived with the Phoenician fleet, was the source of this art (of letters) for the Greek people, who were still uncultivated.

Tacitus's account agrees with 735 in several ways: there is linear development (*primi, inde*¹⁴¹); the Egyptians, the Phoenicians and Cadmus are all named; all three are associated with *litterae*. There is, however, a significant difference: in Tacitus' account, the Egyptians are explicitly associated with "pictures of animals," i.e., hieroglyphics. Hence, when Tacitus goes on to tell us that the Egyptians call themselves the inventors of letters, *litterae*, it seems reasonable to say that here *litterae* does not refer to true letters but rather to Egyptian hieroglyphics (as in 735, a wide or undifferentiated use of *litterae* that makes room for hieroglyphics). But that reading immediately runs into difficulties, for in what follows Tacitus says that the Phoenicians conveyed letters (we understand *litteras* from what precedes) to Greece and acquired fame as if they had found/invented letters and not received them. The phrase *quae acceperant*, "(letters) which they (the Phoenicians) had received" refers to the letters invented by the Egyptians, i.e., to hieroglyphics, but the letters that the Phoenicians as a people and Cadmus as an individual brought to Greece were true letters (as in line 6 of 735) and not hieroglyphics. It would, I think, be otiose to speculate concerning the cause of the confusion. I leave that to others.

In 735 we are told that the Egyptians first invented letters, *invenerunt litteras*, and the Phoenicians second (line 1). In the case of the Phoenicians, "invent" is understood from what precedes. There is no reason to doubt that understanding of the text. The Greeks knew that their alphabet was fundamentally different from Egyptian hieroglyphics, so that speaking of it being invented at time later than hieroglyphics makes good sense. And given the fact that the Greeks referred to their alphabet as Phoenician, it was easy to assume that the Phoenicians invented it. I cite the oligarch Critias, who attributes the invention of letters to Phoenicians (ap. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 1.50 28C = FVS 88B2 vol. 2 p. 377.6 D–K) and a scholion on Dionysius Thrax, in which we read that Herodotus and Aristotle credited Cadmus with bringing the invention of the Phoenicians to the Greeks

¹⁴¹ The adverb *inde*, "thence," can be used not only of place, things and person but also of time (LS s.v. I and II). In the text of Tacitus, I prefer to understand *inde* as a temporal adverb, but it could refer to persons: "from the Egyptians" the Phoenicians brought letters to the Greeks. Or perhaps both at once.

(GG 1.3 p. 183.2–5 Hilgard = fr. 501.4–7 Rose).¹⁴² Should we, then, say that 735 is on target: there were two systems of writing and two different inventors? Not quite, for although the Phoenicians may be credited with bringing letters to Greece, they did not invent letters whole cloth. Rather, their script is a direct descendent of Proto-Sinaitic/ Proto-Cannite and would over time continue to develop.¹⁴³ The latter is clearly indicated in 735: after an initial sixteen letters, ΑΒΓΔΕΙΚΑΜΝΟΠΡΣΤΥ, had been brought to Greece by Cadmus, ΖΘΧΦ were invented by Palamedes and ΗΞΨΩ by Simonides, which increased the number to twenty-four (735 lines 5–8).

Palamedes, the son of Nauplius (line 6), was one of the heroes of the Trojan War. He fell afoul of Odysseus when he exposed the latter's attempt to avoid joining the Greek expedition by feigning madness. Subsequently Odysseus avenged himself by forging a letter incriminating Palamedes in a plot to betray the Greek army. According to tradition Palamedes spoke in his own defense but was convicted and stoned to death. Gorgias' version of the defence has Palamedes claiming to be not only innocent but also a great benefactor of the Greeks and all mankind. He is made to list a string of significant discoveries including letters as an aid to memory: γράμματα τε μνήμης ὄργανον (FVS 82B11a.30.26 vol. 2 p. 301.26D–K). The claim to have invented letters is not original with Gorgias (c. 485–375 BC). It goes back at least as far as Stesichorus (c. 600 BC) and is unqualified: τὸν Παλαμῆδην φησὶν εὐρηκέναι (*scil.* τὰ στοιχεῖα), "He (Stesichorus) says that Palamedes invented (the elements/letters)." In other words, Palamedes does not lay claim to four letters (e.g., the four letters mentioned in 735) but rather to letters simpliciter (fr. 36 p. 115 Page = scholium on Dionysius Thrax, GG vol. 1.3 p. 183.13–15 Hilgard). The lack of qualification is appropriate to a speech of self-defence: Palamedes is listing important benefits that he has bestowed and chooses to omit any qualification that might diminish the benefit.¹⁴⁴ Fair

¹⁴² See Herodotus (485–25 BC), *Histories* 5.58, where we read that the Phoenicians who came to Greece with Cadmus brought with them letters, γράμματα, that were previously unknown. The Greeks gave the name Phoenician to these letters, as was just, for the Phoenicians brought them to Greece: εἰσαγαγόντων Φοινίκων ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα Φοινικῆα κεκλησθαι. This passage does not refer to the Phoenicians as the inventor of letters but only as their conveyor to Greece.

¹⁴³ J. Healey, *The Early Alphabet* (Berkeley: University of California 1990) 16–19, 35–38. For further and fuller discussion of modifications to the Phoenician alphabet, I defer to experts: see, e.g., Powell, op. cit. and R. Woodward, *Greek Writings from Knossos to Homer* (Oxford: University Press) 1997.

¹⁴⁴ In a display speech wrongly attributed to Alcidas, Odysseus is made to refute Palamedes' claim to have invented letters (*Art. script.* 22.16.24 page 146. 3–9 Rademacher).

enough, but we should not think of Theophrastus doing historical research and reporting what he believes to be factually correct. Theophrastus knew that Palamedes belongs to a largely mythical past and that he had come to be viewed as a paradigm of ingenuity. As such Palamedes was capable of all kinds of inventions including the alphabet, either the whole of it or a portion as in 735. Moreover, we should keep in mind that 735 is presented as an excerpt from the *Robe*, which may or may not be Theophrastean. And if it is Theophrastean, most likely it belongs among works like those entitled *On Inventions*: fascinating reading for the curious but not necessarily history.

Simonides, the son of Leoprepes line (line 7), hailed from the island of Ceos. Unlike Palamedes, Simonides belongs to historical times (c. 556–468 BC) and was much admired as a lyric and elegiac poet. He was also regarded as wise and credited with several inventions: in particular, a system of mnemonics, an eighth string for the lyre¹⁴⁵ and letters of the alphabet. There is no strong reason to doubt that he contributed to the development of the alphabet, and 735 may be correct in listing ΗΞΨΩ. The same four letters are attributed to Simonides in two scholia on Dionysius Thrax, where the letters are described as two long and two double: τὰ δύο μακρά, τὸ Η καὶ τὸ Ω, καὶ τὸ διὰ διπλᾶ, τὸ Ξ καὶ τὸ Ψ (GG vol. 1.3 p. 191.30–31, cf. p. 185.3–7 Hilgard). That said, we should take note of the fact that the grammarian Victorinus fails to specify which letters are attributable to Simonides. He assigns to the Phoenicians the same sixteen letters as 735 and the two scholia on Dionysius Thrax,¹⁴⁶ but in regard to Palamedes and Simonides he says only that they added letters that brought the number up to twenty-four. After that Victorinus lists his sources, among whom are Theophrastus' pupil Demetrius of Phalerum, Hermocrates and several Latin authors (Victorinus, *Grammar* 1.4.95–96 [p. 87.1–8 Mariotti] = Demetrius of Phalerum, fr. 147 SOD). Victorinus' report is less complete than 735 and the scholia, but it is compatible with these sources. The two sets of four letters have been collapsed into one set of eight, and the individual letters are not given. It is reasonable to assume that Demetrius accepted his teacher's account of the development of the alphabet.

G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: University Press 1963) p. 173 suggests that the speech is a product of the school Gorgias.

¹⁴⁵ Pliny, *Natural History* 7.204. The claim that Simonides invented the third note on the lyre (*Suda*, s.v. Σιμωνίδης = Σ 439, LG vol. 1.4 p. 361.8–9 Adler) is “a mistake; the lyre had seven strings from the 7th cent” (D. Campbell, *Greek Lyric*, Loeb ed. vol. 3 [1991] p. 330 n. 7).

¹⁴⁶ The list of sixteen letters in the text of Victorinus is corrupt, but the number sixteen is firm and the list is brought into line with 735 and the scholia on Dionysius Thrax by convincing emendations.

One of the scholia on Dionysius Thrax comments that some people credit Epicharmus and not Palamedes with the invention of the letters ΖΘΧΦ (p. 185.6–7). That moves the addition forward in time from the Trojan War to the end of the sixth century and the first quarter of the fifth. It also invites comparison with a passage in Pliny's *Natural History*, in which we are told of two groups that differ concerning who invented letters¹⁴⁷ but agree that Cadmus brought sixteen letters from Phoenicia to Greece and that Palamedes and Simonides added four each: ΖΥΦΧ and ΨΞΩΘ, respectively.¹⁴⁸ After that we are told that Aristotle prefers an original eighteen letters and that later two letters, Χ and Ξ,¹⁴⁹ were added by Epicharmus and not by Palamedes (7.192 = Aristotle, fr. 501 Rose³). That differs from the scholium on Dionysius Thrax, in which Epicharmus is credited with inventing ΖΘΧΦ. In addition, Aristotle's preference for an original eighteen letters puts him in disagreement with Theophrastus, who in 735 is said to recognize an original 16 letters. That may excite our interest. In earlier comments, I have already taken note of three passages in Pliny's *Natural History*, in which a difference between the two Peripatetics is recorded. The passages concern the invention of bronze (7.197 = 731), towers (7.195–196 = 732) and painting (7.205 = 733). The difference is real, but these passages, even taken together, cannot be said to demonstrate serious disagreement between teacher and pupil. For we are not dealing with reports drawn from scientific treatises. That is certainly true of 735, which explicitly names the *Peplos*, and in all probability it is true of 731–733, for these texts most likely derive from works *On Discoveries* or at very least from texts in which the two Peripatetics recorded traditions that were not based on scientific research. See the commentary, above, on texts 731–733.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷ After stating as his own opinion that letters have always existed among the Assyrians, Pliny refers to two groups, one of which holds that letters were invented among the Egyptians by Mercury, while the other prefers the Syrians (*NH* 7.192).

¹⁴⁸ Caveat: the manuscripts differ concerning the Greek letters and so do the modern editions. ΖΥΦΧ and ΨΞΩΘ are printed in the Teubner, ΖΥΦΧ and ΨΞΩΘ in the Loeb, and ΗΥΦΧ and ΨΞΩΘ in the Budé. Given the frequency with which Greek letters are garbled in Latin manuscripts, one is tempted to speak of two additions of four letters without naming the individual letters.

¹⁴⁹ Again we have the same problem concerning Greek letters (see the preceding note). The Teubner prints Χ and Ζ, the Loeb Ψ and Ζ, and the Budé Φ and Χ. Hyginus, *Myths* 277.1 connects Epicharmus with Π and Ψ. The *Suda*, s.v. Ἐπιχάρμος (*LG* vol. 1.2 p. 393.28, no. 2766 Adler) connects Epicharmus with the long letters Η and Ω.

¹⁵⁰ On 732 see above p. 162, on 731 p. 165, on 733 p. 169.

In concluding this comment on 735, reference should be made to another Theophrastean text, 681, which is also concerned with the Greek alphabet. The text is found in pseudo-Alexander who is almost certainly drawing on Syrianus.¹⁵¹ Theophrastus is cited as the source of a report concerning Archinus,¹⁵² who offered a physiological explanation of how the double consonants Ζ, Ξ and Ψ are pronounced. If we ask what Theophrastean work stands behind the report, we might answer *On Discoveries*, suggesting that Theophrastus introduced Archinus' physiological explanation concerning the pronunciation of sigmatic compounds as a quasi-footnote to an account of the invention of letters and in particular the addition of sigmatic compounds to the Attic alphabet. But it is also possible that Theophrastus introduced the explanation in his work *Περὶ λέξεως*, *On Style or Expression* (666 no. 17a). We can compare Aristotle's discussion of λέξις in the *Poetics*, where we are told that letters differ in accordance with the formation of the mouth and the region of the mouth in which the different sounds are produced (20 1456b31–32). Or we might think of a collection of *Problems* (727 no. 3–5), in which Theophrastus offered a physiological explanation of articulated speech. But no text points in that direction; further speculation would be otiose.

736A Dunchad, *Glosses on Martianus Capella* 5.433 p. 214.2 Dick (p. 40.24–27 Lutz)

736B John Scotus Eriugena,¹⁵³ *On Martianus Capella* 5.435 p. 214.12 Dick (p. 110.14–16 Lutz)

736C Remigius of Auxerre, *On Martianus Capella* 5.435 p. 214.12 Dick (vol. 2 p. 70.18–21 Lutz)

Literature: Usener (1870) pp. 605–607, (1873) pp. 434–435; Manitius (1911) pp. 331–332, 335–337, 513–514, 525–526; Rabe (1931) p. viii; Lutz (1939) pp. xx–xxv, 227–233, (1944) pp. xxiii–xxvi; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1542; Préaux (1953) p. 456; Kennedy (1963) p. 60; Schmitt (1971b) pp. 255–256; Sheldon-Williams (1973) p. 3; Fortenbaugh (2005) pp. 165–169; Sharples (2005) pp. 62–63

¹⁵¹ In the text-translation volumes, the text of ps.-Alexander is printed and that of Syrianus is referred to in the apparatus of parallel texts. That was a mistake, and in a second edition the texts might be reversed.

¹⁵² Archinus was an Athenian who played an important role in the restoration of democracy in 403–402 BC. He also promoted a reform of the Athenian alphabet, which brought it in line with the Ionic alphabet: the long letters Η and Ω were added as were the double consonants Ξ and Ψ (Ζ was already part of the Attic alphabet). For fuller discussion, see *Commentary* 8 (2005) pp. 234–235.

¹⁵³ On “Eriugena” as against “Erigena,” see above Chapter II “The Sources” p. 35 n. 101.

Texts 736A–C are taken from three Carolingian commentators (9th century) on Martianus Capella's work *On the Marriage of Philology and Neptune* (5th century). The commentators are concerned with the fifth book, whose subject is rhetoric. In particular, their comments are focused on the opening of the book, in which Martianus introduces a woman who later will identify herself as Rhetoric (5.438 p. 216.3–4 Dick). Initially she is presented as an imposing figure: tall, confident and beautiful. She carries weapons with which she is said to defend herself and to wound her enemies. Her powers are such that she has brought under her control the people of Athens and Rome (5.426–427 p. 211.9–212.8). In what follows, it becomes clear that her weapons are those of the rhetorician or skilled orator, who has mastered argument, arrangement, diction, delivery and memory (5.428 p. 212.8–20).¹⁵⁴ Behind this woman come the great orators of earlier times including Demosthenes and Cicero (5.429–432 p. 212.20–214.1), and going before her is Tisias, who is bearing a sign/emblem and a rod of precedence, *signum ac praeuiam virgam gestans*, on top of which there is a crow with a golden mouth or beak, *corax oris aurati* (5.433–434 p. 214.1–9). Some believed that the woman, if Greek, was the sister of Apollo, i.e., Artemis, while others thought that if she were Roman, then she might be one of the Corvinian family, *si Romulea, de gente Corvina* (5.435 p. 214.9–12). That prompts a lengthy speech by the woman, who states that she is Rhetoric, whom some call art, others excellence in speaking, and still others discipline (5.438 p. 216.3–5).

All three commentators are concerned with the passage summarized above: each reports that Corax invented the art of words and each cites the *Robe* of Theophrastus as the source of the report. Nevertheless, the commentators differ in the lemma that they select and print. “Dunchad” picks out the word *signum* (p. 214.2), Eriugena picks out the phrase *de gente Corvini* (p. 214.12) and Remigius picks out the second half of a disjunctive conditional sentence *aut si Romulea est, de gente Corvini* (p. 214.12).¹⁵⁵ The

¹⁵⁴ Without saying so explicitly, Martianus recognizes the five parts of rhetoric that were well established by the end of the Hellenistic period: argument (*inventionis ingenium*), arrangement (*disponendi ordo*), diction (*facundae ubertatis eloquium*), delivery (*voltus vocisve sonus; pronuntiandi congruens modulatio; gestus in motu*) and memory (*capacis memoriae recordationisque thesaurum*). In the case of Theophrastus, we can be sure that he recognized argument, arrangement and diction. He is likely to have recognized delivery or at least contributed to its recognition by the Stoics. He did not recognize memory. See *Commentary 8* on rhetoric and poetics (2005) p. 72, 426.

¹⁵⁵ On the reading *Corvini* in the text of Eriugena and Remigius as against *Corvina*, which is found in Dick's text of Martianus, see below with note 158.

last two are hardly different. Remigius has simply printed more, i.e., the disjunctive conjunction *aut* and the antecedent as well as the consequent of the second conditional.

The lemma selected by “Dunchad” occurs ten lines earlier than the lemmata of Eriugena and Remigius. The distance is noticeable but not great. More important is the fact that throughout these lines Martianus is engaged in word play, beginning with the word *corax* (p. 214.4), which is a transliteration of the Greek noun *κόραξ*, a common noun meaning crow but also the proper name of Corax of Sicily, the putative inventor of the art of words. Hence, when Martianus tells of a crow, *corax*, on top of Tisias’ rod (p. 214.4), he is not only describing the rod as capped with a particular kind of bird but also referring to the Sicilian rhetorician. Four lines later that crow is referred to in Latin by the noun *corvus*: *respectans superpositum corvum*, “(Tisias) looking at the crow placed above” (p. 214.8). And another four lines later, the word play continues, when Martianus writes, *si Romulea, de gente Corvina* (p. 214.12). The alert reader connects the family name with the preceding use of *corvus* and in addition recalls the fabulous story of Marcus Valerius defeating a Gaul thanks to the intervention of a crow, as a result of which Marcus and his ancestors acquired the cognomen *Corvus* or in adjectival form *Corvinus* (Livy, *From the Founding of the City* 7.16.1–5, 12).¹⁵⁶ For my taste, the word play here is overdone, but Martianus’ readers are likely to have been pleased with their own intelligence in making the connections.¹⁵⁷

Problems arise when one shifts one’s attention from Maritanus to the commentators and in particular to Remigius, who not only offers a more inclusive lemma than Eriugena, but also offers a fuller comment. He agrees with Eriugena in citing the *Robe* of Theophrastus, in reporting that Corax invented the art of words and in reading *de gente Corvini* instead of *de gente Corvina*. The latter is found in Dick’s text of Martianus, (p. 214.12) and the former in Lutz’s editions of Remigius (p. 70.19) and Eriugena (p. 110.14).¹⁵⁸ At first reading, the difference seems minor: a mere shift in case ending. *Corvini*

¹⁵⁶ For the form *Corvinus*, see Livy 7.32.15, 40.3. For further discussion, see H. Volkmann, “Valerius (Corvus),” *Paulys Realencyclopädie* vol. VIIA (1948) col. 2413–2415.

¹⁵⁷ That a reader or listener is pleased with himself when he grasps what has been left unstated is hardly a new idea. Theophrastus will have made the point in his rhetorical writings. See 696 and *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) pp. 310–316.

¹⁵⁸ In his edition of Martianus, Dick prints *Corvina*, which is the reading of codices β and A and the *editio princeps*. Other codices have *Corvini*. In her edition of Eriugena, which is based on a single codex, and in her edition of Remigius, which is based on several, Lutz prints *Corvini*.

is masculine singular genitive, apparently a proper noun referring vaguely to a member of the Valerii. *Corvina* is ablative feminine singular in agreement with *gente*, so that the reference is directly to the family and not mediated through an unspecified individual. Were that the end of the matter, we might prefer the reading of Martianus as printed by Dick and let pass the variant found in Eriugena and Remigius. But it is not the end, for Remigius chooses to explain *Corvini*. He declares him a rhetor/orator, identifies him with Corax and says that he conveyed Theophrastus' rules to the Latins. That is serious confusion. Remigius has turned a member of a prominent Roman family into a Sicilian Greek, who is the reputed founder of the art of words. The fact that a much later member of the *gens Corvina*, Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus (64 BC – 8 AD), was well known as an orator and sometimes distinguished from other members of the family by the name *Messalla orator* (Pliny, *Natural History* 35.8) could have contributed to the confusion, but that is a guess and it does little to mitigate the foolishness of Remigius' words. Indeed, the foolishness is compounded, when Remigius goes on to say that Corax conveyed the rules of Theophrastus to the Latins. That has a 5th century Sicilian, namely Corax, conveying rules that were allegedly written by a Peripatetic philosopher, who postdates Corax by a century or more.

In what follows, Remigius cites Theophrastus' *Robe* for the report concerning Corax *qua* founder of the art of words. The citation and report are entirely in Greek. That is not the case with Eriugena, who translates the Greek into Latin. My guess is that Remigius has drawn on Eriugena and chosen to omit the Latin, but it is possible that both may be dependent on an intermediary. More important is the question whether we should accept the attribution of a work entitled *Robe* to Theophrastus? The title is missing in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings and is mentioned only by writers of the ninth century. Perhaps they possessed a late compilation that was known as the *Robe* of Theophrastus, or they may have known of such a compilation through an intermediary, but that is only a guess. See Chapter II "Titles of Books" no. 10.

All three commentators speak of a τέχνη λόγων, which "Dunchad" and Eriugena translate with *ars verborum*. The fact that τέχνη λόγων occurs and not τέχνη ῥητορική is of some interest, for the expression τέχνη ῥητορική is not found before Plato, who uses it in his *Gorgias* 449A4–5. The expression τέχνη λόγων appears to be the earlier of the two,¹⁵⁹ so that our texts may be

¹⁵⁹ See Th. Cole, *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins 1991)

exhibiting a certain sophistication in using τέχνη λόγων in regard to Corax. I would like to think that the sophistication goes back to Theophrastus, but that cannot be demonstrated with certainty. What can be said is that Theophrastus will have been familiar with Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and therefore known that his teacher attributed to Corax a τέχνη that was composed of a particular kind of argument based on probability (2.24 1402a17–20). He will also have known what Aristotle may have said about Corax in his *Τέχνων συναγωγή*, *Collection of Arts*,¹⁶⁰ or in some other lost work.¹⁶¹ Against this background (including lectures within the Peripatos and Theophrastus' own demonstrable interest in rhetoric), it is reasonable to believe that Theophrastus did discuss Corax in regard to early work on argument and persuasive speech in general. But in the absence of additional evidence, we can only guess at the details of such a discussion and into what work or works it may have been incorporated. As already observed, the *Robe* remains something of a mystery, despite the unqualified attribution to Theophrastus by three Carolingian commentators.

718 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 1.40 22C5–8 (*BT* vol. 4 p. 49.15–18 Kaibel)

Literature: Regenbogen (1940) col. 1532; Lucas (1968) p. 252; Anderson (1980) p. 92; Fortenbaugh (1985) p. 283 = repr. (2003) pp. 270–271, (2005) p. 149

Text 718 has been printed in the text-translation volumes in the section on “Music.” In any second edition of the text-translation volumes, it should be referred to from the section on “Discoveries,” for the text concerns an innovation in musical performance, which is comparable to other innovations that are recorded in collections of “firsts.”¹⁶²

p. 98 and G. Kennedy, “Historical Survey of Rhetoric” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, ed. S. Porter (Leiden: Brill 1997) p. 3.

¹⁶⁰ See Cicero, *Brutus* 46 = Aristotle, fr. 136 Rose³ under the heading *Τέχνων συναγωγή*, where, however, there is no explicit reference to the Aristotelian work. For brief discussion, see *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric and poetics (2005) pp. 164–165.

¹⁶¹ Diogenes Laertius reports that in the *Sophist* Aristotle credited Empedocles with the invention of rhetoric (*Lives* 8.57 = fr. 65 Rose³). That need not have prevented some mention of Corax, perhaps in regard to argument. Moreover, since the *Sophist* seems to have been a dialogue (Moraux p. 32), it is possible that an interlocutor other than Aristotle introduced Corax and discussed his contribution to the development of rhetoric.

¹⁶² 718 concerns the first person to combine the playing of the aulos with bodily motion. We may compare Pliny the Elder's discussion of inventions and innovators (*Natural History* 7.191–215), in which mention is made of the person who first combined the playing of the lyre with voice and the person who instituted singing to the music of pipes (7. 204).

718 is taken from Book 1 of *The Sophists at Dinner*, where Athenaeus is discussing dancing and dancers.¹⁶³ In this context, Athenaeus cites Theophrastus for a report concerning two players of the aulos: Andron of Catania in Sicily¹⁶⁴ and Cleolas of Thebes in Boeotia. The text runs as follows.

Θεόφραστος δὲ πρῶτόν φησιν Ἄνδρωνα τὸν Καταναῖον αὐλητὴν κινήσεις καὶ ῥυθμοὺς ποιῆσαι τῷ σώματι αὐλοῦντα· ὅθεν σικελίζειν τὸ ὀρχεῖσθαι παρὰ τοῖς παλαίοις· μεθ' ὃν Κλεόλαν τὸν Θηβαῖον.

Theophrastus says that Andron of Catania was the first aulos-player to make rhythmical movements with his body as he played; hence dancing was called “Sikelizing” by the ancients; and after him was Cleolas of Thebes.

After telling us that Andron was the first aulos-player to make rhythmical movements with his body, Athenaeus adds “after him (Andron) there was Cleolas of Thebes,” i.e., Cleolas was younger than Andron. To my knowledge, neither Andron nor Cleolas are mentioned elsewhere in Greek literature.¹⁶⁵ In private correspondence, Massimo Raffa has suggested to me that Andron belongs to the first half of the fifth century, and Cleolas to the late fifth and early fourth century. He basis the suggestion on a passage in the ninth book of Pausanias’ *Description of Greece*, in which reference is made to Pronomus, the Theban aulos-player, who was able to delight his audience with facial expressions and movements of the entire body (9.12.6). Since Pronomus was active c. 400 BC and Pausanias does not refer to Pronomus as the first person to combine aulos-playing with bodily motion, Raffa finds it reasonable to assign Andron an earlier floruit, perhaps the first half of the fifth century. In his forthcoming commentary on the musical fragments of Theophrastus, Raffa will offer a full discussion of 718.¹⁶⁶ Here I limit myself to four questions that relate to “firsts.”

¹⁶³ Book 1 of *The Sophists at Dinner* exists only as an epitome. See above, Chapter II “The Sources” no. 7 p. 27.

¹⁶⁴ Catania on the east coast of Sicily is Catana in Latin.

¹⁶⁵ The Andron referred to in Athenaeus’ text is no. 9 in K. von Jan, *Paulys Realencyclopädie* vol. 1 (1894) col. 2159 (“aus unbestimmter Zeit”), no. 8 in Pape and Bensler vol. 1 p. 89 and no. 45 in *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. IIIA, ed. P. Fraser and E. Matthews, p. 40. He is not to be confused with Andron of Halicarnassus, who discussed the invention of the alphabet and the origin of cremation (FGh 10 F 9–10). That Andron is no. 11 in E. Schwartz, *Paulys Realencyclopädie* vol. 1.2 (1894) col. 2159–2160 and no. 13 in Pape and Bensler vol. 1 p. 89 9 (the relevant volume of *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, i.e., VB, awaits publication). The Cleolas referred to in Athenaeus’ text is no. 1 in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* vol. 11 (1922) col. 676 (W. Capelle), no. 2 in Pape and Bensler, vol. 1 p. 674 and no. 1 in *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* vol. IIIB, ed. P. Fraser and E. Matthews, p. 235.

¹⁶⁶ *Commentary* 9.1.

- 1) Does the mention of Andron and Cleolas constitute an awkward interruption? At first reading, it gives that impression, for the focus has been on dancers and dances (20C–22C) and will immediately return to dancers (22C–D). But we need to keep in mind that Book 1 has come down to us in the form of an epitome, which opens the door to awkwardness and apparent irrelevance. I cite two examples. First, after remarks on dancers and the verb “to dance” (20C–21A), Hermipus is cited in regard to Theophrastus’ appearance during lecture: he dressed himself splendidly, glistened with oil, and used all kinds of bodily motions, even sticking out his tongue in imitation of a gourmet (1.38 21A–B = 12). There is a slide here from dance to lecture, but in both cases we are dealing with performance involving motion. Moreover, the epitomist is likely to have omitted material that mitigated the slide, perhaps helping us accept the slide as typical of lively discussion among banqueters, in which unbroken systematic progression would be unreal.¹⁶⁷ Second, following a discussion of dances and dancers (21D–22A), we are told that according to Chamaeleon, Aeschylus wrote his plays when intoxicated (22A).¹⁶⁸ That does seem irrelevant, but in what precedes, Aeschylus has been mentioned as an inventor of dance figures and Telestes as Aeschylus’ gifted dancer. In that context, the intoxication of Aeschylus may be seen as an irrelevance, which suits a banquet and which may have been eased into the text by words omitted in the epitome.
- 2) How should we understand the phrase ὅθεν σικελίζειν τὸ ὀρχεῖσθαι παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς? At first reading, the phrase may seem abrupt and perhaps out of place, coming, as it does, between the mention of Andron and Cleolas. But once again we need to keep in mind that Book 1 has come down to us in the form of an epitome, which opens the door to apparent dislocation. Moreover, there is a straightforward way to understand the phrase in question. We are being told of a lexical innovation that followed on an innovation in performance. Andron of Catania in Sicily was first to introduce bodily motion when performing on the aulos and that innovation prompted people to speak of “sikelizing.” That seems

¹⁶⁷ If *The Sophists at Dinner* were a scholarly treatise, we might say that the slide from dance to lecture would be mitigated by placing the description of the Theophrastus in a footnote. But the hypothetical is a non-starter. Athenaeus has not written and did not intend to write a treatise in which consistency over long stretches is a virtue.

¹⁶⁸ Chamaeleon, fr. 43b Martano.

to me straightforward,¹⁶⁹ but there are at least two worries. First, the phrase in question tells us that dancing (no qualifier is added) came to be known as “sikelizing.” That would be remarkable: the performance of an aulos-player gave rise to a verb that might be applied to any dance and not just the bodily motions of an aulos-player. Here a simple supplement suggested by Andrew Barker and reported to me by Massimo Raffa neatly limits the usage of “sikelizing.” From the preceding αὐλοῦντα supply αὐλοῦντας before ὀρχεῖσθαι. That is certainly an appealing suggestion, but it remains a conjecture.¹⁷⁰ The second worry concerns the reference to the ancients, οἱ παλαιοί, who began to speak of “sikelizing.” If Andron belongs to the fifth century, even the early fifth century, it seems odd to speak of the people whom he influenced as οἱ παλαιοί. To be sure many firsts are referred to the ancients,¹⁷¹ but would Theophrastus have referred to fifth century Sicilians as ancients? Perhaps Athenaeus is responsible for the phrase παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, but if so, is he responsible for the entire phrase beginning with ὅθεν? Moreover we need to keep in mind that Pausanias’ report concerning Pronomus provides no more than a date *ante quem*. For a date *post quem*, the best that I can do is to cite the date 729 BC, when Catania was first settled.¹⁷² I leave the matter undecided.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁹ A comparable case is provided by Dicaearchus, who mentioned a certain aulos-player who did not abide by the rules of piping. That, we are told, gave rise to the saying “The piper pipers” (fr. 98 Mirhady = pseudo-Zenobius, *Summary of the Proverbs of Didymus Tarrhaeus* 2.100 [1868] p. 368.16–18 Miller). In a culture in which music plays a significant role, a change in performance will be noticed and can affect how people express themselves (λέξις), either by the coining of a new word or by the creation of a clever saying.

¹⁷⁰ I would caution that actually printing the supplement in the text at 22C, might be a mistake, for if the printed text is understood to be that of the epitome and if the epitomist omitted the needed qualifier, then the supplement should appear in the apparatus as “understood” from the now lost fuller text of Book 1. For completeness’ sake, I would distinguish between the case under consideration and the remark at 21A that people used to apply the verb “to dance” to motion and excitation: ἔτατον γὰρ τὸ ὀρχεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ κινεῖσθαι καὶ ἐρεθίζεσθαι. For if one looks at the two examples that follow, it seems clear that ὀρχεῖσθαι is being used metaphorically. It is not clear that metaphor is relevant to what is said concerning σικελίζειν.

¹⁷¹ In regard to proverbs that are of such antiquity that the originator has been forgotten, the use of adjectives like ἀρχαῖος and παλαιός may be expected. See the introduction to Section 2 on “Proverbs” pp. 196, 199–200.

¹⁷² For the date 729 BC, see K. Ziegler, “Katane” in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 7 (1919) col. 2473.

¹⁷³ If we resist supplying αὐλοῦντας before ὀρχεῖσθαι and understand the words σικελίζειν τὸ ὀρχεῖσθαι παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς to be a report about the use of σικελίζειν to refer to dancing in general, i.e., to ὀρχεῖσθαι without qualification, then it is tempting to think that the report itself was an invention intended to explain a use of σικελίζειν, which was old and whose origin

- 3) In interpreting 718, should we be influenced by Aristotle's remarks concerning bad aulos-players who add much movement to their musical performance, spinning round in order to represent a discus (*Poetics* 26 1461b30–31)? If we think that Theophrastus had this kind of performance in mind, then we are apt to view Andron as the first-aulos player in a devolutionary spiral that led to unwanted excess.¹⁷⁴ But that is almost certainly wrong. Text 718 makes no reference to excess and there is no good reason to imagine one. Most likely Theophrastus credited Andron with a positive innovation: namely adding to the music of the aulos certain bodily motions, which were appropriate and seen as an enhancement.¹⁷⁵ To be sure, in time there would be excesses, but they need not have been present at the outset and Theophrastus does not say that they were.
- 4) Is Athaeus reporting what Theophrastus said in *On Discoveries*? That is certainly possible, and if it is correct, then our text provides an example in which the material in *On Discoveries* went beyond a bare bones statement of who did what first, *πρῶτος*. It offered in addition not only a lexical note concerning the use of *σικελίζειν* but also reported who came second after Andron. If we keep in mind that we have only an epitome of Book 1, it seems likely that these brief additions were fleshed out in the original text. That said, there are other possibilities. One is that Athenaeus' report goes back to a musical work: in particular, to *On the Musicians* (714 no. 2 = Diogenes Laertius 5.49 = 1.260).¹⁷⁶ Andron and Cleolas would appear among the musicians who were discussed at some length or simply mentioned with few details. Another possibility is that the aulos-playing of Andron and Cleolas received mention in one or both of the works *On Poetics* (666 no. 20 and 21 = Diogenes Laertius 5.47, 48 = 1.223, 230). Following Aristotle, Theophrastus could have compared the delivery of a stage figure with the performance of an aulos-player. Still another possibility is the work *On*

had been forgotten. In that case the Andron in question never existed. Or there may have been an Andron who played the aulos and also was known as a dancer. In that case, he might have been picked out in order to explain the usage in question. But this is speculation.

¹⁷⁴ See above pp. 138–139.

¹⁷⁵ Anderson p. 92 is correct when he says that the words *κινήσεις καὶ ῥυθμούς* are of central importance. The focus is on rhythmical movements.

¹⁷⁶ Regenbogen col. 1532 thinks it probable that 718 is from Theophrastus' work *On Music* (714 no. 1 = Diogenes Laertius 5.47 = 1.213). In my early article (1985) p. 283, I followed Regenbogen. I now prefer *On the Musicians*, but mention of Andron and Cleolas in both works cannot be ruled out.

Delivery (666 no. 24 = Diogenes Laertius 5.48 = 1.236). It may have been an inclusive work that discussed the delivery of orators, actors, rhapsodists and musicians. Andron and Cleolas will have found their place among the musicians.¹⁷⁷ That said I want to underline that Andron and Cleolas may have been mentioned in more than one work. Certainty is beyond our reach.

2. Proverbs

Proverbs are part of our daily lives. When we were young, our parents taught us with proverbs. “An apple a day keeps the doctor away” was intended to improve our eating habits, and “The early bird gets the worm” helped get us to school on time. As we grew older and engaged in sports, “Practice makes prefect” reminded us that repetitions make champions, and when we began to make our own way in the world, “A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush” reminded us that taking a smaller gain as against gambling on a larger one in the future is often the right choice. Some of us may never have asked ourselves what these sayings have in common. Others will have put the question and perhaps even read what scholars say about proverbs. But whether the question is new or old, most of us will be able to agree that proverbs are familiar sayings that are taken seriously. They convey useful truths that have been observed by earlier generations and that have been passed on in a form that is concise and attractive.

The usefulness of proverbs together with their attractive style has encouraged people to make collections, which may be arranged in a variety of ways: e.g., by topic, by first word, by country, or quite randomly. Library holdings regularly include one or more collections, and the same is true of many private homes in America and Europe and elsewhere. The practice of collecting is not new: it goes back to the ancient Greeks and well beyond, at least as far back as the third millennium when “commonsensical codes of conduct and everyday observations of human nature were inscribed on Sumerian cuneiform tablets.”¹⁷⁸ Among the Greeks the earliest collection referred to is that of Aristotle, who seems to have acquired an interest in proverbs

¹⁷⁷ See my “Theophrastus on *Delivery*” (1985) p. 283 and *Commentary* 8 on rhetoric (2005) p. 149.

¹⁷⁸ W. Mieder, *Proverbs* (Westport CT: Greenwood Press 2004) p. xii (word order reversed). Mieder’s book is an excellent introduction to the topic of Proverbs, albeit focused on proverbs expressed in the English language.

while he was a student in Plato's Academy (see below). No text tells us that Plato wrote a work on proverbs, but he makes abundant use of proverbs in ways that suggest a clear understanding of certain features that characterize proverbial sayings. In particular, Plato mentions their antiquity (e.g., at *Lysis* 216C, the proverb "The beautiful is dear" is described as ancient, ἀρχαία; cf. *Cratylus* 384A–B, where "Knowledge of noble things is difficult to acquire" is said to be an ancient proverb, παλαιὰ παροιμία). He also describes them as true or correct (e.g., at *Sophist* 231C, the proverb "It is not easy to escape all [the wrestler's grips]" is described as correct, ὀρθή; cf. *Menexenus* 247E, where "Nothing in excess" is characterized as well said, καλῶς λέγεσθαι). And he assumes that they are familiar to his audience (e.g., at *Republic* 1.3 329A, in order to recall the proverb ἡλιξ ἡλικά τέρπει, "Two of an age delight each other," it is sufficient to say "Some of us having the same age come together"; cf. *Laws* 5 741D, where the words "No one who is evil will know, but only the person who has experience and become good through habits" are deemed sufficient to recall an ancient proverb, perhaps "No one inexperienced will know"¹⁷⁹). But there is no record of Plato either having collected proverbs or having studied them for their own sake.

In contrast, we can say that Aristotle wrote a work entitled Παροιμίας, *Proverbs*.¹⁸⁰ It is listed by Diogenes Laertius in his catalogue of Aristotelian writings and reported to have been one book or roll long (5.26). Given the title it is reasonable to suppose that the work brought together numerous proverbs, but since the work has not survived, it is impossible to say with any certainty how the work was organized and whether it offered not only comments on individual proverbs but also generalizations concerning the nature of proverbial sayings. Moraux argues plausibly that the work was written while Aristotle was still a member of the Platonic Academy.¹⁸¹ He also sees a connection with the criticism directed by Cephisodorus, a pupil of Isocrates, against Aristotle for not doing something worthwhile when he collected proverbs (Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 2 60D–E). According to Moraux, the criticism is directed at Aristotle's *Proverbs*, and if that is correct, then it may be thought to tell against the idea that Aristotle offered significant commentary on the proverbs that were collected in the work. To be sure, Cephisodorus, a pupil of Isocrates, had little interest in treating Aristotle fairly, but even if the criticism is telling against the work enti-

¹⁷⁹ R. Bury in the Loeb edition vol. 1 p. 370 n. 1 suggests that the proverb was οὐδείς ἀπειρος εἴσεται. He compares *experientia docet*.

¹⁸⁰ On Aristotle and proverbs, see Kindstrand pp. 72–75, 78.

¹⁸¹ Moraux (1951) pp. 128, 334–337.

tled *Proverbs*, it does not follow that Aristotle failed to draw on *Proverbs* elsewhere and at a later date. Indeed, given Aristotle's interest in rhetoric, it is at least possible and perhaps likely that when lecturing on rhetoric, he turned to his collection for examples of concise proverbs that involve metaphor and create a pleasing style (see *Rhetoric* 3.11 1413a17–20 with *Poetics* 21 1457b6–16).¹⁸² Similarly when lecturing on rhetorical argument, Aristotle may well have dipped into his collection for examples of proverbs used in both technical proofs (2.21 1395a19–20) and in non-technical proofs (1.15 1376a2–7).¹⁸³

Most interesting may be Aristotle's assertion that some proverbs, like “Attic neighbor,” are maxims: ἔτι ἔναι τῶν παροιμιῶν καὶ γνώμαι εἰσιν, οἷον παροιμία Ἀττικὸς πάροιχος (2.21 1395a19). The assertion implies that Aristotle had thought about the difference between a maxim and a proverb. But how he would have explained the difference is nowhere stated with clarity. Indeed, we are never offered an essential definition of the proverb, and what Aristotle says about the maxim is context dependent. In the relevant portion of the *Rhetoric* (2.21), Aristotle is concerned with argumentation—he is preparing to discuss the enthymeme in the next chapter (2.22)—and with that in mind he offers a definition of the γνώμη that is narrowly focused on enthymematic reasoning. We are told that the γνώμη is a general statement and not about a particular fact. In addition it is a statement about practical matters and what is to be chosen and what to be avoided with a view to action. We are then told that the enthymeme is a syllogism concerning action and that γνώμαι are the conclusions and premises of enthymemes (2.21 1394a21–28). That is not an everyday understanding of γνώμη. Nor does it take account of the fact that the word γνώμη has a wide range of meanings, including thought, opinion, proposition and maxim.¹⁸⁴ It is, however, suitable in its context and has the effect of excluding proverbs that are not general statements. An example might be “As the Carpathian (brought in) the hare,” which Aristotle speaks of as a proverb when discussing urbanity as part of rhetorical style (3.11 1413a14–19). To be sure, the proverb can be used

¹⁸² On the pleasure provided by proverbs, see *Commentary* 8 (2005) pp. 385–386, 388, 392.

¹⁸³ In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle devotes a chapter to non-technical proofs (1.15 1357a22–1377b12). They number five: laws, witnesses, contracts, the testimony of slaves and oaths. Proverbs appear under witnesses. For brief discussion with reference to Theophrastus, see *Commentary* 8 (2005) pp. 92–96.

¹⁸⁴ See LSJ s.v. In Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.11 1143a19–24, γνώμη is used of sympathetic understanding. For γνώμη in the sense of proposition or motion, see 624.3.

metaphorically in reference to any number of individual cases in which an intended benefit ultimately causes harm,¹⁸⁵ but in itself the proverb refers to a particular action by a well-intended individual.

In addition to calling the γνῶμη a general statement, Aristotle characterizes it as a statement about practical matters: what is to be chosen and what is to be avoided. That has the effect of excluding sayings that are not tied to action, but it is difficult to think of a proverb that is not tied to action. An example might be “If a north wind lays hold of mud, a storm (or winter) comes straightway.” The saying is found in both the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* (21.46 945b2–4) and Theophrastus’ *On Winds*, where it is labeled a proverb (46).¹⁸⁶ At first reading, we may want to say that the proverb is meteorological in orientation and for that reason qualifies as a proverb that does not belong among maxims, which have an essential tie to action. Perhaps, but we should not overlook the fact that in a largely agricultural and/or nautical society, the proverb might be understood as action-guiding: given a northerly wind and an imminent storm, prudent, i.e., evasive action is called for.¹⁸⁷

Not very different is the saying “Attic neighbor,” which Aristotle cites as an example of a proverb that does qualify as a γνῶμη (2.21 1395a19–20). At first reading “Attic neighbor” might seem to be descriptive and nothing more. But if we reflect on what it is to be an Attic neighbor and understand that such a person is clever, energetic and likely to become bothersome,¹⁸⁸ then the proverb will be viewed as practical. At very least, it prompts a person to deliberate how best to deal with a neighbor whose very proximity spells trouble.

Immediately after citing “Attic neighbor” as a proverb, Aristotle says that one ought to use maxims that contradict sayings that have become part of the public domain—e.g., “Know yourself” and “Nothing in excess”—when doing so will give the appearance of a better character or convey emotion

¹⁸⁵ See Commentary 8 (2005b) pp. 380–383.

¹⁸⁶ I want to thank Robert Mayhew for calling my attention to these passages.

¹⁸⁷ In *Problems* 21.45 (the section immediately preceding that in which is found the saying “If a north wind lays hold of mud, a storm comes straightway”), there is a related proverb (a meteorological proverb concerning winds) that is explicitly tied to action: It is good to sail, when the south wind begins and the north wind ceases.

¹⁸⁸ E. Cope, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary* (Cambridge: University Press 1877) vol. 2 p. 216 cites Thucydides, *Histories* 1.70, where the Athenian character is described as restless, audacious, quick of wit and the like, which makes the Athenians a troublesome people, who do not allow others to live in peace.

(2.21 1395a20–23).¹⁸⁹ What Aristotle says seems to continue the discussion and to sharpen the distinction between maxims and proverbs by qualifying proverbs as sayings that have become public, τὰ δεδημοσιευμένα and then citing two well-known proverbs. Such a reading of Aristotle's statement is encouraged by the fact that Plato viewed proverbs as well known or familiar (see above) and that viewing proverbs in this way is what we (moderns¹⁹⁰) might expect. Indeed, I do not doubt that when asked Aristotle would say that proverbs are familiar because they have become part of public discourse. But it should be noted that in the present passage Aristotle uses the neuter τὰ δεδημοσιευμένα. That suggests supplying ἀποφθέγματα, which I understand to be used inclusively for sayings in general. To be sure, Aristotle may have preferred to avoid repetition, i.e., he preferred to use τὰ δεδημοσιευμένα and to avoid τὰς παροιμίας, which would pick up παροιμία in what precedes. But guessing what was going on in Aristotle's head is best left to others. Indeed, it may be that a new train of thought (or one only loosely related) begins with the statement concerning the public domain.

Before leaving Aristotle, I want to call attention to a text of Synesius, in which Aristotle is said to have characterized proverbs as the remains of an ancient philosophy, which was largely lost through widespread destruction. Fragments, however, were saved on account of their brevity and cleverness (*Encomium of Baldness* 22 p. 229 Terzaghi = fr. 13 p. 30.27–31.3 Rose³). The idea of widespread destruction recalls *inter alia* Book 3 of Plato's *Laws*, in which extensive flooding necessitated the gradual rebirth of human community.¹⁹¹ In line with the *Laws*, we might think of an Aristotelian dialogue, especially *On Philosophy* (Diogenes Laertius 5.22),¹⁹² in which the survival of ancient

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Plato's *Protagoras* 343C, where Socrates is made to say that Simonides wanted to achieve fame by demolishing a saying of Pittacus. See above, Chapter III "Titles of Books" no. 12 p. 118.

¹⁹⁰ See Mieder (above n. 178) pp. 2–4 where proverbs are characterized not only as "traditional" but also as "current" and "generally known."

¹⁹¹ On Plato's account of the devastation caused by flooding, see the introduction to the section on "Discoveries and Beginnings" p. 136. Other accounts together with scholarly literature are listed by Kindstrand pp. 74–75 n. 19.

¹⁹² Pace K. Rupprecht, "Παροιμία and Paroimiographoi" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 18 (1949) col. 1737, who attributes Synesius' text = fr. 13 Rose to Aristotle's *Proverbs*. The attribution to Aristotle's *On Philosophy* is now generally accepted. According to Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.22, *On Philosophy* was three books or scrolls in length. *On Philosophy* is also found in Hesychius' *Life of Aristotle*, where it occupies third place in the catalogue of Aristotelian writings (p. 83 Düring). That agrees with its position in Diogenes' catalogue, but in Hesychius' catalogue *On Philosophy* is said to be four books long. That the work was a dialogue is no longer open to doubt. See Moraux pp. 30–31, who says that in the first book of *On Philosophy*

proverbs may have been attributed to stylistic features: διὰ συντομίαν καὶ δεξιότητα, “on account of concise and witty expression” (fr. 13 p. 31.3). Such accounts might be called upon to explain why many proverbs are anonymous. The names of the persons who first formulated the proverbs were lost in the widespread destruction. But in the absence of a clear statement tying proverbs to anonymity, it would be hasty to claim that Aristotle made anonymity an essential feature of the proverb. A feature that holds for the most part might be reasonable, but that is different from always.

Theophrastus, Aristotle’s pupil and successor as head of the Peripatetic School, followed his teacher in that he, too, wrote a work on proverbs. In Diogenes’ catalogue of Theophrastean writings it carries the title Περὶ παροιμιῶν, *On Proverbs*, and is said to have been a single book or roll in length (5.45 = 1.148 = 727 no. 14). Two other Theophrastean texts mention the title: one is found in Harpocration’s *Lexicon of the Ten Attic Orators* vol. 1 p. 60.16–61.2 Dindorf = 737, where Περὶ is supplied before παροιμιῶν,¹⁹³ and the other occurs in Stobaeus’ *Anthology* vol. 3.21.12 p. 558.14–559.2 Hense = 738, where Περὶ does occur. On the basis of these two texts, Kindstrand declares it possible that Theophrastus may have made an advance over Aristotle by distinguishing between a proverb and a saying, a παροιμία and an ἀπόφθεγμα. Possible, yes; proven, no. See below, the commentary on 737 and 738.¹⁹⁴

There are other texts that mention Theophrastus in connection with proverbs, but none mentions the work *On Proverbs*. Two are found in Aristotelian commentators and refer to the Theophrastean work *On Dispositions*

Aristotle will have treated sayings like “Know yourself” and “Nothing in excess” (on these sayings, see below on 738 and 738.5) and will have presented proverbs as the remains of ancient wisdom, which survived cataclysms that partly annihilated humanity.

¹⁹³ The supplement Περὶ is not to be doubted. The transmitted text reads: Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ παροιμιῶν. The noun παροιμιῶν, genitive plural, following the article τῷ, dative singular, strongly suggests that Περὶ has been lost in transmission. We might suppose that a book number has fallen out between τῷ and παροιμιῶν, but Diogenes’ catalogue tells that the Theophrastean work was only one book long. Moreover, the title Περὶ παροιμιῶν is attested not only by Diogenes but also by Stobaeus (738.2).

¹⁹⁴ To support the possibility that Theophrastus made an advance over Aristotle, Kindstrand claims that Theophrastus “went somewhat further than Aristotle in many other cases.” And this claim he supports by citing G. Rosenthal, “Ein vergessenes Theophrastfragment,” *Hermes* 32 (1897) pp. 317–320. That is unfortunate. To be sure, Rosenthal claims that Theophrastus advanced beyond Aristotle by substituting a tripartite division of the maxim for a bipartite division. But the claim depends on Gregory of Corinth and ignores the fuller text of John the Deacon. See my article “Theophrastus, Fragment 70d Wimmer: Less, Not More,” *Classical Philology* 81 (1986) pp. 135–140 and *Commentary* 8 (2005) on rhetoric and poetics pp. 205–207.

(529A and B). Two are found in Athenaeus' *The Sophists at Dinner*: one refers to *On Pleasure* (549), and the other fails to mention a title (710). Two others mention no title: one occurs in Plutarch's *Greek Questions* (624) and the other in a scholium to Euripides' *Hippolytus* (738.5). On these texts, see below this section.

Other Peripatetics merit mention in regard to proverbs. One is Dicaearchus of Messana, a contemporary of Theophrastus, who took an interest in proverbs and used them in his writings on cultural history. According to Zenobius, Dicaearchus in his work *On Greece* said that at meals it was not customary for the ancients to distribute portions, but when a shortage of food occurred, then the custom of portions prevailed. And for this reason, there arose the proverb "A portion does not choke." Zenobius' discussion continues, introducing a second reason that speaks directly to the idea of choking: prior to the introduction of portions, the more powerful grabbed the food of the weaker and ended up choking to death. (*Summary of Lucillus Tarrhaeus and Didymus* 5.23 = Dicaearchus, fr. 57 Mirhady).¹⁹⁵ In discussing the simple life enjoyed by men of an earlier time, Porphyrius refers to Dicaearchus, who said that the simple and extemporaneous food of early men is manifested in the saying "Enough of the oak." It was uttered by the man "who first changed (his mode of living/diet), as seems reasonable" (*On Abstinence from Eating Animals* 4.2.6 = fr. 56A Mirhady).¹⁹⁶ This time no title is mentioned but the context is clearly cultural history.¹⁹⁷ Zenobius names Dicaearchus in connection with six other proverbs. Without discussing each in detail, it is, I think, reasonable to say that Zenobius' remarks document

¹⁹⁵ Zenobius (2nd cent. AD) composed a collection of sayings based upon the earlier collections of Didymus of Alexandria and Lucillus of Tarrha. Mirhady's edition of Dicaearchus is found in *Dicaearchus of Messana* = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 10 (2001) pp. 1–142.

¹⁹⁶ The phrase "as seems reasonable," οἷα εἰχός, is appropriate to a saying whose origin goes back to an early prehistoric time. It is deemed a reasonable hypothesis that someone, whose name is necessarily unknown, coined the phrase "Enough of the oak," and that person was the first person to change his diet, τοῦ μεταβάλλοντος πρώτου. But, in fact the person who coined the phrase need not have been the first person to stop eating acorns. He might have been the second or third person or someone who lived a decade later.

¹⁹⁷ Porphyrius (3rd cent AD) was a pupil of Plotinus, whose works he edited. Porphyrius introduces the same proverb earlier in *On Abstinence*, where he is drawing on Theophrastus (2.5.6 = 584A.28). On this portion of *On Abstinence* and Theophrastus' developmental account of sacrificial practices, see above, the introduction to Section 1 "On Discoveries and Beginnings" pp. 136–142. It is clear that a proverb like "Enough of the Oak," viewed as a relic of the past, can be helpful in reconstructing the life of early man.

Dicaearchus' interest in explaining proverbs (3.65 = fr. 44; 3.99 = fr. 91;¹⁹⁸ 4.26 = fr. 68) and pinning down their origin, either by reference to a particular time/event (6.16 = fr. 75) or person (2.15 = fr. 97; 2.100 = fr. 98).¹⁹⁹

Among the several Dicaearchan fragments that refer to proverbs, most important for Theophrastean studies is a text found on a single folio that was inserted in codex Vaticanus Graecus 435 between the letters and speeches of Synesius.²⁰⁰ There we read that the ancient Romans did not pursue reputation through clever speeches and exceptional sayings in the way that some Greeks did. Five well-known sayings/proverbs are cited and their usefulness and attractiveness is acknowledged. Dicaearchus is then introduced as someone who opposed attributing these sayings to wise men, for the ancients did not do philosophy with speech. He believed that in their time wisdom was the practice of noble deeds and that the art of popular speech developed later.²⁰¹ The ancients did not enquire whether they should engage in politics or whether they should marry. Rather, they did so and regarded the use of sayings (proverbs) as vulgar. That concludes the report concerning Dicaearchus. It is brief²⁰² but full enough to suggest certain connections with Theophrastus. Opposing noble deeds to the art of popular speech might be construed as a poke at Theophrastus, whose interest in attractive style is well-known (681–704). So too enquiring whether one should marry might be understood as a criticism of the Eresian. For according to Jerome,

¹⁹⁸ Although Dicaearchus is not named in this text, it has been assigned to Dicaearchus by Kugéas and is included by Mirhady in his collection of texts. See Mirhady's note 2 to the translation.

¹⁹⁹ I do not claim that the categories are exclusive. In fr. 98, Dicaearchus recognizes that there was a particular individual, a certain piper (αὐλητής τις), to whom the proverb "The piper pipes" goes back, but that individual is not named. Instead the proverb is said to derive from his manner of piping. Kindstrand p. 76 n. 28 compares the phrase ἔθεν εἰς παροιμίαν ἦλθεν ὁ λόγος (fr. 98.3–4 M) with Aristotle, fr. 551 1569a28–29 Bekker = fr. 593.8 R³: εἰς παροιμίαν παρήλθε τὸ πρᾶγμα, and fr. 470 1555b14 B = fr. 513.10 R³: εἰς παροιμίαν ἦλθε.

²⁰⁰ The folio (220 recto and verso) has been published by H. von Arnim, "Ineditum Vaticanum," *Hermes* 27 (1892) pp. 118–130 = fr. 31 Wehrli and fr. 36 Mirhady. The text carries the heading "Plutarch's or Caecilius' Roman Sayings." Arnim p. 119 argues that the heading is a mistaken guess.

²⁰¹ Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.40 where we read that according to Dicaearchus the Seven Sages were neither wise nor philosophers, but rather shrewd and adept at legislation. Although Diogenes' report differs from that of the Vatican codex in that it withholds the predicate "wise" rather than reinterpret it in terms of noble deeds, the outcome is the same. The ancients were not philosophers but rather men of action whose good works included legislation.

²⁰² In Arnim's text, the Dicaearchan material runs for 11 plus lines. That count includes the last three lines, in which Arnim emends φασίν to read φησίν. The emendation is accepted by Wehrli and Mirhady.

Theophrastus put the question in his little golden book *On Marriage* and went on to speak against marriage (486). But caution is in order, for Jerome was something of a misogynist, and Jerome's text suggests that he may be drawing, through a secondary source, on a Theophrastean thesis in which a positive answer was given alongside a negative one.²⁰³ The same may be true of the question whether one should engage in politics. While instructing his students in argumentation, Theophrastus may well have put the question to his students and had them argue both sides of the issue. It is true that we have a letter from Cicero to Atticus, in which Cicero mentions a "great controversy" between Dicaearchus and Theophrastus: the former is said to have championed the active life of politics, while latter supported the philosopher's life of contemplation (481). But such a controversy between the two Peripatetics is mentioned nowhere else in our sources. Indeed, it seems to be the creation of Cicero, who thought it clever/amusing to identify Atticus, the Epicurean, with Dicaearchus, who is presented as an advocate of political involvement. Atticus, being a close friend of Cicero, will have appreciated Cicero's playfulness and not been annoyed at having his Epicurean credentials challenged.²⁰⁴ Be that as it may, it is clear that Dicaearchus was interested in proverbs. He was prepared to offer explanations, and in certain contexts like cultural history, he introduced proverbs as evidence regarding the prehistoric period.

Another Peripatetic is Clearchus of Soli. Also a contemporary of Theophrastus, he wrote a work on proverbs, to which Athenaeus refers eight times using the title *Περὶ παροιμιῶν*, *On Proverbs*. Apparently Athenaeus regarded *Περὶ παροιμιῶν* as the standard way to cite the Clearchan work. The work seems to have been two books long and therefore somewhat longer than the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus. For fuller discussion of the title of Clearchus' work and its length, see above, Chapter III "Titles of Books" no. 14 pp. 125–126. Here I limit myself to the following brief notices, all of which are based on reports found in Athenaeus' *The Sophists at Dinner*. Clearchus was aware that the conciseness and the metaphorical nature of proverbs are apt to make proverbs difficult to interpret. Hence, he sees a close relationship between proverbs and riddles (Athenaeus 10.457C = fr. 63.I

²⁰³ *Nota bene*: after formulating the question, Jerome gives first a positive response and then a negative one. Only the positive response is reduced to c. two lines (486.7–10). See *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) pp. 78–82, 410–415.

²⁰⁴ For further discussion, see Fortenbaugh (2013) 515–519 and "Peripatetic Writings *On Lives*," forthcoming in *Clearchus of Soli: Texts, Translation and Discussion* = Rutgers University Studies on Classical Humanities 20.

Wehrli) and introduces explanations into his collection of proverbs. The explanations may spell out the primary meaning of a proverb (e.g., “The small fry have seen the fire” is explained by noting the way in which such fish are cooked [7 285C–D = fr. 81]). Other explanations may involve cultural history (e.g., reference is made to marriage festivals and to the legendary Cecrops who was said to be the first person in Athens to join one man to one woman [Athenaeus 13 55C–D = fr. 73])²⁰⁵ and may introduce gods (e.g., “Shoot son” is what Leto is reported to have said to Apollo, when they were confronted by the Python [15 701C–D = fr. 64]). In addition, Clearchus may take notice of a particularly interesting application of a proverb, and on occasion he may cite a proverb and explain it in ways that differ from other writers on proverbs including Theophrastus (e.g., “No bad fish is large” [8.40 347F–348A = fr. 80] is altered slightly and applied to a different individual by Theophrastus [348A = 710]).²⁰⁶ I return to Clearchus below.

Still another member of the Peripatos was Theophrastus’ pupil Demetrius of Phalerum (c. 350–280 BC). Most likely he never became a teaching member of the School, but his relationship with Theophrastus was close. For ten years beginning in 317 BC, he served as overseer in Athens under Cassander. Most likely it was during this period that Demetrius used his political influence to assist Theophrastus in securing land for the School. In 307 when Poliorcetes captured Athens, Demetrius removed first to Thebes and then to Alexandria, where he will have influenced the development of intellectual life under Ptolemy I, including the founding of the Museum and the Library. Our special concern is with a collection of sayings found in Book 3 of Stobaeus’ *Anthology*. It carries the heading Δημητρίου Φαληρέως τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα, “Demetrius of Phalerum’s *Sayings of the Seven Sages*.” The collection includes some one hundred twenty-eight sayings, which are organized by attribution to seven different σοφοί, wise men or sages: Cleoboulus, Solon, Chilo, Thales, Pittacus, Bias and Periander (3.1.172 [vol. 3 p. 111.7–125.2 Hense] = fr. 114W = fr. 87 S). There is no introduction telling us how Demetrius selected his Seven Sages (whereas Plato had included Myson, Demetrius replaces him with Periander²⁰⁷), how he decided cases of

²⁰⁵ The idea that Cecrops was first, πρῶτος, signals a tie between works *On Proverbs* and works *On Discoveries*. Both are concerned with firsts (albeit *On Discoveries* more so) and both dip into cultural history.

²⁰⁶ On text 710, see below pp. 225–227.

²⁰⁷ The Platonic text is *Protagoras* 343A. For brief remarks on 338E–347A see above Chapter III “Titles of Books” no. 12 pp. 117–118.

contested attribution,²⁰⁸ and whether he drew a distinction between proverbs and sayings, παροιμῖαι and ἀποφθέγματα (on this distinction, see below on 737–738 pp. 214–218).²⁰⁹ The first four groups of sayings, those assigned to Cleoboulus, Solon, Chilo and Thales number 20 sayings each, but that equality disappears with the final three groups of sayings, those of Pittacus, Bias and Periander.²¹⁰ The individual sayings exhibit notable variety in form. Some are quite brief, conveying a single injunction. Others introduce a contrast between what is recommended and what is to be avoided. Still others provide a reason for acting in accordance with the saying.²¹¹ Variation is not in itself to be faulted, but the overall impression is that Demetrius has taken over an existing collection, which he edited in some measure but never completely unified. Be that as it may, we can say that collecting the practical injunctions of an earlier period fits well with the general Peripatetic interest in gathering materials of various kinds, not only constitutions and laws but also, e.g., the winners of dramatic and athletic contests and who discovered

²⁰⁸ As an example, I cite “Nothing in excess.” In the collection of Demetrius, it is attributed to Solon (Stobaeus vol. 3 p. 114.6), but in 738.5 it is assigned to Chilo, Sodamus, Sisypheus and Pittheus.

²⁰⁹ The collection of Demetrius assigns the saying “Know yourself” to Chilo (Stobaeus vol. 3 p. 116.2) but in 738 we read that Theophrastus understood the saying as a proverb, but most people assign the saying to Chilo and Clearachus held that it was said by the god to Chilo. Understanding the saying as a proverb suggests anonymity, but no source states explicitly that Theophrastus made anonymity a defining mark of a proverb. (The same is true of Aristotle [see above, p. 200].). Althoff-Zeller p. 18 see a connection between assigning sayings to particular wise men and Aristotle’s understanding of a dialectical premise: one which is accepted by everyone, or most people or the wise, and among the wise either all or most or the best known and most famous (*Topics* 1.1 100b21–22). That is interesting, and it makes clear that a collection such as that of Demetrius could play a role in dialectical exercises within the Peripatetic School. Moreover, such a role might encourage assigning sayings to particular individuals, for picking out the best known and most famous among the wise implies comparing individuals in terms of their reputations. I add only that in certain circumstances, perhaps most, alleging that a saying has been embraced by all Seven Sages and other wise individuals as well might carry more weight than assigning a saying to a single person no matter how exalted his reputation might be.

²¹⁰ Althoff-Zeller p. 10 point out that the fifth and sixth group end with material that could be used to make 20 sayings. That is not true of the final group.

²¹¹ Lengthening a saying by adding to it is, of course, a well know practice. Not surprisingly we find it among the sayings attributed to Demetrius by Diogenes Laertius in his *Life of Demetrius*. The commonplace “Wealth (is) blind,” is lengthened by adding the words “also the fortune that guides it on its way.” In Diogenes the passage runs: οὐ μόνον τὸν πλοῦτον ἔφη τυφλόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ὁδηγοῦσαν αὐτὸν τύχην (5.82 = fr. 121 W = fr. 1.115–116 S). Before Demetrius, Plato in his *Laws* played with the same commonplace by having the Athenian Stranger add a clever qualification. When the Athenian Stranger places wealth fourth among the human goods, he is made to say: οὐ τυφλός, ἀλλ’ ὅξυ βλέπων, ἀνπερ ἅμ’ ἔπεται φρονήσει, “not blind (wealth), but keen of sight, providing that it follows along with wisdom” (1 631C).

what.²¹² In regard to Demetrius we may cite his *List of Archons* (Diogenes Laertius 1.22 = 149 W = 93 S),²¹³ his *Collection of Aesopic Fables* (1.80 and 81 = fr. 1.63 and 108 S) and his Book of *Chriae* (5.81 = fr. 113 W = fr. 81 no. 5 S).²¹⁴

In concluding these introductory remarks, I want to call attention to a different collection of sayings that is found in Stobaeus' *Anthology* immediately after that of Demetrius (3.1.173 p. 125.3–128.9). It carries the heading Σωσιάδου τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν ὑποθήκαι, "Sosiades' *Directives of the Seven Sages*." Who this Sosiades might be is unknown. As in the case of Demetrius' collection, there is no introduction to the sayings that follow upon the heading.²¹⁵ Striking is the uniform manner in which the individual directives are formulated. Most involve two words and all divide into two parts: frequently a second person singular imperative in combination with a word or phrase that fleshes out the directive. Despite the reference to the Seven Sages in the heading, the sayings are not distributed between seven persons. Treating the sayings collectively fits well with the tradition that the Seven Sages interacted, meeting together at the courts of Cypselus and Croesus, at the Pan-Ionian festival, in Corinth and Delphi (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.40). At Delphi, they are said to have dedicated in the temple their sayings as first fruits to Apollo, inscribing the famous sayings "Know yourself" and "Nothing in excess" (Plato, *Protagoras* 343A–B). We might have expected these two famous sayings to enjoy pride of place in Sosiades' collection, but that is not what we find. "Nothing in excess" is found in thirty-eighth place and "Know yourself" appears in a variant form in eighth place.²¹⁶

Of special interest is the way in which Sosiades' collection relates to what we know of a stele that was erected in Ai-Khanum on the River Oxus in Bactria (Afghanistan) sometime in the third century BC. Only a small piece of the stele proper survives, but its base has survived, and on that base is

²¹² Brink col. 918.

²¹³ In the *List of Archons*, Demetrius exhibits interest in the Seven Sages, when he says that during the archonship of Damasias (582 BC) Thales was first to be called "wise," when the Seven Sages acquired their name (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.22 = fr. 149 W = 93 S).

²¹⁴ Much as chriae were useful in rhetorical exercises (presented with a chria or pregnant sentence often formulated as a reply, the student was required to elaborate the chria into a short essay), so a collection of sayings by particular sages might become the basis of a student's essay.

²¹⁵ The absence of any introduction might suggest that Sosiades has merely copied an existing list (perhaps that at Delphi [see below on Clearchus]), but even if Sosiades was copying an existing list, that need not rule out interventions of one kind or another. Maltomini p. 8 thinks it likely that Sosiades played an active role and not that of a mere transcriber.

²¹⁶ "Know yourself" appears as σαυτὸν ἴσθι and not as γνῶθι σαυτὸν.

written an epigram, which tells us that above on the stele were written wise words of famous older persons, which were dedicated in sacred Delphi. The words are said to have been copied by Clearchus who set them up in the precinct of Kineas.²¹⁷ The base also contains five sayings/directives, which with only minor variation are the same as the five directives that come last the collection of Sosiades. Scholars have reasonably argued that the stele in Ai-Khanum contained more or less the same set of sayings as the collection of Sosiades.²¹⁸ In addition, the Clearchus mentioned on the base has been indentified as Theophrastus' contemporary and fellow Peripatetic. That is more problematic (at issue is when the stele was set up [early third century, 250 BC, or later?]) and when Clearchus lived [was he a direct student of Aristotle and could he have been alive in c. 250 BC?]). If the Clearchus in question is the Peripatetic, then we have impressive evidence of Peripatetic interest in sayings extending to the eastern edge of the Greek world in the third century BC. If he is not the Peripatetic but rather a homonym, who happened to be, e.g., a citizen of Ai-Kahnum, then we have impressive evidence of traditional Greek wisdom on display in the East at far remove from Apollo's sanctuary.²¹⁹

529A Anonymous, On Aristotle' Nicomachean Ethics 5.3 (5.1 OCT)²²⁰ 1129b29–30 (no. L89, *QETHs* pp. 5–2 Fortenbaugh)

²¹⁷ Kineas may have been the founder of the city. See M. Bernard, "Ai Kahnum on the Oxus: A Hellenistic City in Central Asia," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 53 (1967) p. 90; "Résumé chronologique," *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum I* (Paris 1973) pp. 105–106; L. Robert, "De Delphes à l'Oxus. Inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane" in *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* vol. 112.3 (1968) pp. 431–432; "Les inscriptions," *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum I* (Paris 1973) pp. 217–222; A. Narain, "On the Foundation and Chronology of Ai-Khanum: a Greek Bactrian City," in *India and the Ancient World*, ed. G. Pollet = *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* vol. 25 (Leuven 1987) p. 116, 129; Althoff-Zeller p. 59 n. 82.

²¹⁸ Since most of the stele is lost, the qualifier "more or less" is prudent and even necessary. That said, it should be underlined that the single surviving piece of the stele exhibits letters that match entries no. 47 and 48 in the collection of Sosiades (p. 126.3 Hense). See Althoff-Zeller p. 60 and 65.

²¹⁹ If the stele dates from the early third century, then it is hard to believe that the Clearchus mentioned on the base is anyone other than the well-known Peripatetic. But the issue is still open. For discussion see Robert (1968), op. cit. pp. 443–457, A. Narain, op. cit. pp. 116–129, and Althoff-Zeller pp. 59–61.

²²⁰ The numerals 5.3 report the division of chapters found in Bekker's edition of Aristotle's treatises. The references in *CAG* are based on Bekker and we printed them in FHS&G. In writing commentaries, I have preferred to use the divisions of the Oxford Classical Texts, which today are more available and more widely used.

529B Michael of Ephesus, *On Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* 5.3 (5.1 OCT) 1129–1130 (CAG vol. 22.3 p. 8.10–14 Hayduck)

Literature: Usener (1878) p. 70; Heylbut (1888) p. 197; Walzer (1929) p. 80; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1479–1480; Groningen (1966) p. 58; Mercken (1973) p. 21*, (1990) p. 429; West (1978) p. 164; Fortenbaugh (1984) pp. 259–261, (2011) pp. 543–547; Moraux (1984) p. 326, 329; Magnaldi (1991) pp. 40–41 n. 18; Barnes (1999) p. 15; Wehrli-Wöhrlé (2004) p. 529

Texts **529A** and **B** are concerned with the proverb “In justice every virtue is brought together.” The focus on justice and virtue explains our decision to print **529A** and **B** among the ethical texts and to discuss them in *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 543–547. Nevertheless, the texts cite a proverb of some interest and for that reason should be referred to from the section on proverbs. In any second edition of the text-translation volumes, that can be accomplished by inserting a reference to **529A** and **B** at the beginning of the section on proverbs.

In the present commentary, I shall not repeat everything that has been said in the earlier commentary. Rather, I refer the interested reader to that commentary for discussion of justice *qua* complete virtue not only in relation to other people but also in relation to the law, i.e., being law-abiding. In addition, I shall not repeat my criticism of Walzer, who cites **529A** as evidence that Theophrastus was more interested in historical details than Aristotle. The same holds in regard to Wehrli, who cites **529A** and **B** as evidence that the arrangement of Theophrastus' *Ethics* was different from that of the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

Texts **529A** and **B** are drawn from two different commentaries on Book 5 of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. One of the commentaries is anonymous; the other is by Michael of Ephesus. Both texts belong to a discussion of Chapter 1, in which Aristotle discusses justice, δικαιοσύνη, conceived of as complete virtue. More precisely, the two texts are concerned with the sentence, καὶ παροιμιαζόμενοι φάμεν “ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετὴ ἓν,” “and quoting a proverb we say, ‘In justice every virtue is brought together’” (5.1 1129b29–30). The Anonymous commentator quotes three lines of the poet Theognis (6th century BC), of which the third line runs ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶσα ἀρετὴ. The line differs slightly from what Aristotle wrote: πᾶσα ἀρετὴ replaces πᾶς ἀρετὴ ἓν. It also differs slightly from what Theognis wrote: for metrical reasons the last words will have been πᾶς ἀρετὴ'σιν.²²¹ The Anonymous identifies the line as a proverb and tells us

²²¹ Theognis, *Elegies* 147 vol. 1 p. 181.1 West.

that Theophrastus, in the first book of his work *On Dispositions*, speaks of the line as a proverb. The Anonymous also tells us that in the first book of his *Ethics*, Theophrastus says that Phocylides (6th century) makes mention of the proverb.²²² The Anonymous adds, perhaps Phocylides did use the proverb or both Phocylides and Theognis did. I offer four reflections.

First, we know that Theophrastus wrote a work *On Proverbs* (727 no. 14), but that work is not referred to in 529A-B. Rather, we are told that Theophrastus mentions the proverb concerning justice in two different works, whose titles are clearly ethical: *On Dispositions* and *Ethics*. It may be that Theophrastus also mentioned the proverb in his work *On Proverbs*, and if he did we might want to say that the work was (perhaps largely) a collection of proverbs, on which Theophrastus drew when discussing, e.g., ethics or politics or rhetoric. But in the case before us, it is not necessary that Theophrastus drew on a preexisting collection. Proverbs are the stuff of every man and Theophrastus was no exception. Simply addressing the topic of justice *qua* complete virtue might have been sufficient to remind him of a proverb that fits the topic.

Second, the Anonymous commentator expresses himself cautiously concerning Phocylides: ἴσως καὶ Φωκυλίδης αὐτῷ ἐχρήσατο, “perhaps also Phocylides used it (the proverb).” Caution is, of course, admirable; it is at least possible that Theophrastus nodded. But in the present case, it seems reasonable to believe that the two poets, both belonging to the sixth century, made use of the same proverb. Moreover, there is no reason why Theophrastus should always refer to a proverb in the same way. According to the Anonymous commentator, in *On Dispositions* Theophrastus refers to the proverb in question as a proverb: μέμνηται αὐτῆς ὡς παροιμίας. And in the *Ethics*, Theophrastus said that Phocylides makes mention of it: Φωκυλίδης αὐτοῦ μέμνηται. In regard to *On Dispositions*, the Anonymous neither affirms nor denies that Theophrastus mentioned Theognis, Phocylides or any other poet. In context that is quite intelligible. The Anonymous has just quoted the relevant verse in Theognis and asserted that it occupies the place of a proverb: χώραν παροιμίας ἐπέχει. To support that, he refers to *On Dispositions* and tells us that Theophrastus speaks of a proverb.²²³

²²² Phocylides fr. 10 vol. 1 p. 138 Gentili-Prato.

²²³ It would be quite unreasonable to insist that a person, even a cautious philosopher, always refer to a particular proverb either anonymously (simply as a proverb) or with attribution (naming some particular person), but not now one way, now the other way. We moderns (Americans) know by heart the words “Early to bed and early to rise make a man healthy wealthy and wise.” On one occasion we may refer to it simply as a proverb, but on another

Third, Michael of Ephesus thinks that Theophrastus did cite Theognis in *On Dispositions* (529B.2–3). Maybe he is correct, but the Anonymous commentator does not say that, and Michael is dependent on him.²²⁴ Most likely Michael is influenced by what he read at the beginning of text 529A. There the Anonymous quotes Aristotle's words καὶ παροιμιαζόμενοι φαμεν, "And we say by way of proverb," and then says τοῦτο Θεόγνιδος, "This comes from Theognis." Mindlessly Michael will have made this attribution to Theognis part of what Theophrastus says in *On Dispositions*.²²⁵

Fourth, the proverb "In justice every virtue is brought together" is well suited to a philosophical/analytical work that seeks to distinguish between different kinds of justice: e.g., complete justice or virtue in regard to other people and partial justice which is concerned with distribution and rectification. Assuming that Theophrastus' *Ethics* was an analytical work and *On Dispositions* was too,²²⁶ we may guess that Theophrastus cited the proverb while marking off complete justice from partial justice. No text connects the proverb with three other Theophrastean works, *Ethical Lectures* (Diogenes Laertius 5.47 = 1.200 = 436 no. 3), *Varieties of virtue* (5.42 = 1.84 = 436 no. 7) and *On Virtue* (5.46 = 1.180 = 436 no. 8), but it is not unreasonable to suppose that these works were analytic and that a distinction between kinds of justice may have been drawn and the proverb cited. There are, however, other titles that are ethical in orientation and yet do not suggest a narrow analytic approach. I am thinking of the tripartite title *On Education* or *On Virtues* or *On Temperance* (Diogenes Laertius 5.50 = 1.281 = 436 no. 10) and the simpler title *On Bringing up Children* (5.50 = 1.283 = 436 no. 9a). These

occasion we might attribute it to Benjamin Franklin, who included it in his *Poor Richard's Almanack* for 1735 and 1758. And if we are well-informed, on still another occasion we might refer the saying to someone else like John Clarke, who included it in a bilingual collection of proverbs entitled *Paroemiologia Anglo-Latina* published in 1639. We might even refer to an earlier variant that appeared in Anthony Fitzherbert's work *The Book of Husbandry*, which dates to 1523. (For details I refer to Mieder's interesting discussion of the proverb [pp. 171–180].) The application of these remarks to 529A–B is straightforward. Not only can "In justice every virtue comes together" be referred to both as a proverb and as the saying of an individual, but also *qua* attractive and instructive saying it will have been used by various individuals, who together helped popularize the proverb. In addition the person who immediately comes to mind when one hears or uses the proverb is likely to be an intermediate conveyer of ancient wisdom. The origin of the proverb may belong to a much earlier time and be a variant, i.e., an earlier form that was less attractive and less memorable. Usner (1878) pp. 69–70 (repr. [1912–1913] p. 248) is likely to be correct when he says that originally the saying will have been a line of prose and not a hexameter verse.

²²⁴ See above, Chapter II "The Sources" no. 14 and *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) p. 544.

²²⁵ See *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics p. 544.

²²⁶ On these works, see *Commentary* 6.1 pp. 130–135.

titles do not rule out philosophical analysis, but they also suggest a practical concern with raising children. In such a context, it would be quite appropriate to take notice of the role proverbs can play in conveying ancient truths that are concisely stated and easy to remember. Whether the two works in question actually mentioned proverbs is another matter, but I am inclined to believe that Theophrastus did not ignore their role in education.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the proverb “In justice every virtue is brought together” (5.1.15 1129b29–30) is followed five lines later by “Rule reveals (the) man” (5.1.16 1130a1–2). See the next comment.

737 Harpocration, *Lexicon on the Ten Attic Orators*, on *archê andra deiknusi* (vol. 1 p. 60.16–61.2 Dindorf)

Literature: Dindorf (1853) vol. 2 pp. 115–117; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; Rupprecht (1949) col. 1737; Kindstrand (1978) pp. 75–76; Tosi (2004) pp. 50–51; Dorandi (2005) p. 162

Text 737 is found in Harpocration’s *Lexicon on the Ten Attic Orators*. The lexicon is ordered alphabetically; In Keaney’s recent edition (1991), 737 is no. 245 among the entries beginning with alpha. The text runs as follows.

ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείκνυσι· Δημοσθένης Προοιμίους δημηγορικοῖς. Σοφοκλῆς μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς Ἑλεγείαις Σόλωνός φησιν αὐτὸ εἶναι ἀπόφθεγμα, Θεόφραστος δ’ ἐν τῷ (Περὶ) παροιμιῶν καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης Βίαντος.

“Rule reveals the man:” Demosthenes in the *Political Exordia*. However, Sophocles in his *Elegies* says that it is an apophthegm of Solon, Theophrastus in the work *On Proverbs* and Aristotle (say that it is an apophthegm) of Bias.

There are no serious problems concerning the Greek text. Reading *δημηγορικοῖς* is clearly preferable to reading *δημηγορικῶς*, which occurs not only in manuscripts but also in the Aldine edition. Pace Keaney, supplying *Περὶ* before *παροιμιῶν* is an obvious improvement (see the comment on 727 no. 14, above, p. 124 n. 162).

In 737 Harpocration begins with the saying *ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείκνυσι*, “Rule reveals the man,” after which he refers to Demosthenes’ *Exordia*, which is a collection of introductions, i.e., the opening paragraphs of orations.²²⁷

²²⁷ The attribution of the *Exordia* to Demosthenes has been both denied and defended. Here I refer to F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* (Leipzig: Lokay 1893; reprint Hildesheim: Olms 1962) vol. 3 pp. 322–328, who argues forcefully in favor of the attribution to Demosthenes. I am inclined to agree with Blass but leave the issue undecided. For our purposes, it is

Harpocration is thinking of introduction no. 48, in which the speaker is made to criticize officials who are ignoring a decree of the assembly in regard to equipping a trireme.²²⁸ Exhibiting irony, the speaker states that previously he did not understand the point of the saying “Rule reveals the man,” but now he could explain the saying to another person. For the officials (those being criticized) have no regard for what has been decreed but rather look to personal gain (48.2). In other words, the saying “Rule reveals the man” expresses concisely and in memorable form²²⁹ a truth concerning human behavior. When a person takes office, he attains a position that frees him from normal constraints, so that he is likely to act in accordance with his true character. In *On the Embassy* 19.247, Demosthenes quotes the tragic poet Sophocles, who in the *Antigone* expresses the same idea more fully, “It is impossible to be certain of any man’s soul, mind, intent, until he be proved through offices and laws” (175–177).²³⁰

Harpocration does not cite the *Antigone*, but after referring to Demosthenes, he turns to Sophocles and tells us what the poet says in his *Elegies*: namely, that “Rule reveals the man” is an ἀπόφθεγμα, a saying, of Solon.²³¹ After that Harpocration tells us that “Theophrastus in *On Proverbs* and Aristotle say that (it is a saying) of Bias.” The report concerning Theophrastus and Aristotle is quite brief. No work of Aristotle is cited. Since Theophrastus’ work *On Proverbs* is referred to, it is natural to think of Aristotle’s work entitled *Proverbs*, but the *Nicomachean Ethics* is a safer choice, for in that work

enough to note that other orators earlier than Demosthenes composed collections of introductions (Blass vol. 3 p. 2, 324–325) and that it is the saying “Rule reveals the man,” which is our special concern.

²²⁸ There is no explicit mention of equipping a trireme, but what is said makes clear what is at issue: the officials are on the take, the speaker lacks funds, but would like to do his duty by launching a ship (48.2–3).

²²⁹ Given the brevity of the saying, only three words long, the alliteration of the first two words, alpha twice, is noticeable. Our translation imitates the alliteration with “r” twice.

²³⁰ In the *Suda* (α 4096 Adler), where the saying is quoted and Theophrastus is mentioned, we read that the saying is applied to persons who are moderate before holding office but become violent when holding office. That is certainly one possibility (it is in line with what is said in Demosthenes, *Exordia* 48.2) and the one that will have most often prompted someone to quote the saying. But it is also possible to apply the saying to a person who gains office and continues to exhibit moderate behavior despite the temptations and provocations that might arouse violent behavior in a person of inferior character (cf. Plutarch, *Comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero* 3.2, where we are told that power and rule, ἐξουσία καὶ ἀρχή, rouse every passion and uncover every vice, but Cicero in the exercise of office demonstrated, ἐπιδείξιν ἐποιήσατο, his contempt of wealth and his humanity and goodness).

²³¹ Cf. Solon, T 199 p. 103 Martina: ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν ἀπόφθεγμα εἶναι Σόλωνος, “Others say that it is a saying of Solon” (Apostolius, *Collection of Proverbs*. cent. 4.1 [vol. 2 p. 310.10–11 Leutsch]).

Aristotle not only makes explicit mention of the saying but also attributes it to Bias. The Nicomachean passage is found within the discussion of complete justice, in which Aristotle cites the proverb “In justice every virtue is brought together” (5.1 1129b29–30, cf. 529A.4 and 529B.1). Not long thereafter and as part of the analysis of complete justice *qua* virtue in relation to other people, Aristotle says that the saying of Bias, ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείξει, “Rule will reveal the man,” seems apt. For the person who is ruling is already (acting) in relation to another and within society: πρὸς ἕτερον γὰρ καὶ ἐν κοινωνίᾳ ἡδὴ ὁ ἄρχων (1130a1–2). There is a slight difference between the text of Aristotle and that of Harpocration. In quoting the saying, Aristotle uses the future tense, while Harpocration has the present. That is easily explained. The Lexicon of Harpocration has as its primary focus the ten canonical orators. Accordingly, Demosthenes has pride of place and the lemma records his text. The fact that Aristotle and others quoted the saying in the future tense is simply ignored. Indeed, Harpocration will have been aware that speakers and writers varied the tense according to context, and for that reason he will have deemed the matter trivial.

Harpocration cites three different sources for the saying “Rule shows the man.” The first is Demosthenes, who was a contemporary of Aristotle and Theophrastus. He will have been cited for his use of the saying and not because the saying originated with him. Next come Solon (cited *via* Sophocles) and Bias (cited *via* Theophrastus and Aristotle). Solon lived an exceptionally long life, c. 100 years, and like Bias, he was active in the first half of the sixth century. Given their early date and given that both were counted among the Seven Sages (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.13), it is not surprising that both are named in connection with a saying that was viewed as conveying a useful truth of longstanding. That does not mean, however, that one or the other must have been the first to use the saying. It is also assigned to Pittacus (Diogenes 1.77), who dates to the beginning of the sixth century and therefore was as a contemporary of Solon and Bias. Indeed, well-formulated sayings were movable,²³² so it is often a mistake to force a choice between the named candidates, no one of which may be the true originator.²³³

²³² See below p. 227 on 710.

²³³ Well-formulated sayings also invite clever variation. The saying under discussion provides an example. According to Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft*, when on account of envy the Thebans put Epaminondas in charge of removing dung and water from alleys, he responded by saying, οὐ μόνον ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείκνυσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρχὴν ἀνὴρ, “Not only does rule/office reveal the man, but also man the rule/office.” In saying that, Epaminondas gave the office

According to Ruppercht, Kindstrand, Tosi and Dorandi, texts 737 and 738 make clear/demonstrate that Theophrastus distinguished between an ἀπόφθεγμα and a παροιμία, and in doing so he made an advance beyond what Aristotle had done. That is an interesting claim, but what is the distinction that these scholars are claiming for Theophrastus? Ruppercht and Kindstrand do little more than cite 737–738 and assert that Theophrastus distinguished between ἀποφθέγματα and παροιμίαι. Tosi and Dorandi (drawing on Tosi) do more. They speak of the ἀπόφθεγμα as a famous saying that can become a παροιμία by losing its tie to some single individual or episode and by taking on the role of a commonplace. In 737, the saying “Rule shows the man” is an ἀπόφθεγμα in respect to Bias, and in 738 the saying “Know yourself” is an ἀπόφθεγμα in respect to Chilo. But “Know yourself” is also understood as a παροιμία (ὡς παροιμία λαμβάνεται 738.1), since it has acquired the function of a commonplace in everyday discourse.

For further discussion of 738, I refer to the immediately following comment. Here I want to look more closely at 737, which begins with the saying “Rule reveals the man.” After that, we read of four authors who authenticate or bear witness to the saying: Demosthenes, Sophocles, Theophrastus and Aristotle. In three cases, we are offered not only the name of an author but also the title of a work: *Political Exordia*, *Elegies* and *On Proverbs*. In all four cases, a speaker or writer who used the expression is named: Demosthenes, Solon and Bias (twice). Only once is the expression referred to by means of the common noun ἀπόφθεγμα. Only once is there mention of proverbs, and that is in the title of the Theophrastean work *Περὶ παροιμιῶν*. That hardly establishes a distinction between ἀπόφθεγμα and παροιμία. Indeed, the natural way to read the final clause concerning Theophrastus and Aristotle is to carry over the noun ἀπόφθεγμα from the preceding clause concerning Sophocles. To be sure, the μέν—δέ construction may be read as introducing a contrast; it would be, however, a mistake to see the contrast as one between ἀπόφθεγμα and παροιμία. Rather the contrast is between a text that cites Solon and two texts that cite Bias. Most likely ἀπόφθεγμα is being used

a level of dignity that it had not previously possessed (15 81B). Here the original saying is extended by repeating the words, while reversing their order and the grammatical cases. Moreover, there is difference in what is revealed. Whereas the saying in its original form tells us that holding office reveals the moral and intellectual character of the official, in the expanded saying, i.e., in the second half, the official reveals the way in which the office is regarded. In the case of Epaminondas, he enhances the office, bestowing a dignity that it had lacked.

quite generally for “saying,”²³⁴ and as such it is to be understood in the clause referring to Bias. Indeed, if 737 offers a clue concerning how Theophrastus understood the distinction between ἀπόφθεγμα and παροιμία, it is that the former is used inclusively of sayings that may or may not be proverbs. See below, pp. 216–218.

In conclusion, I want to be clear that the preceding argument only concerns the two nouns παροιμία and ἀπόφθεγμα. It is not applicable to παροιμία and γνώμη. On these two nouns and Aristotle’s remark that some παροιμίαι are also γνώμαι (*Rhetoric* 3.21 1395a19), see the introduction to this section on “Proverbs.”

738 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.21.12 (vol. 3 p. 558.14–559.2 Hense)

Literature: Regenbogen (1940) col. 1535; Rupprecht (1949) col. 1737; Kindstrand (1978) p. 76; Fortenbaugh (1984) pp. 205–206; (2011) pp. 398–402; Bollansée (1999) p. 32 n. 33; Maltomini (2004) p. 14; Tosi (2004) pp. 50–51; Dorandi (2005) p. 162

Text 738 is taken from Book 3, Chapter 21 of Stobaeus’ *Anthology*. The chapter carries the heading Περί τοῦ γινῶθι σαυτόν, “On the (saying) ‘Know yourself’” (p. 556.7 Hense). The text runs as follows:

“γινῶθι σαυτόν” ὡς παροιμία παραλαμβάνεται, μαρτυρεῖ Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ Περί παροιμιῶν. οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ Χείλωνος εἶναι τὸ ἀπόφθεγμα, Κλέαρχος δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λεχθῆναι Χείλωνι.

“Know yourself” is taken as a proverb; a witness is Theophrastus in the (work) *On Proverbs*. But most people (think) that the apophthegm belongs to Chilo,²³⁵ and Clearchus that it was said by the god to Chilo.

Chapter 21, in which 738 occurs, contains twenty-eight entries, all of which are related in one way or another to the expression “Know yourself.” As is normal in Stobaeus, the initial entries are drawn from poets (1–5), after which the selections are from writers of prose. The first fourteen are comparatively brief (6–19); the remainder are longer selections from Plato,

²³⁴ In the text-translation volumes, we ducked the issue by translating ἀπόφθεγμα with “apophthegm,” which occurs in English dictionaries but is essentially a transliteration of the Greek word without the final alpha.

²³⁵ In the text translation-volumes at 738 (vol. 2 p. 597), we spelled “Chilon” with an “n” in imitation of the Greek proper noun. But in the translation of 534 we preferred the Latin rendering and wrote “Chilo” (lines 1 and 6). The Latin spelling is, I think, the more common, so that I have adopted it here and in the translation of 738.5 and elsewhere. But the issue is unimportant, unless one is a consistency-freak.

Xenophon and Porphyrius (20–28). 738 finds its place among the shorter entries; it is no. 12. The immediately preceding entry, no. 11, is attributed to Bias: “Observe as in a mirror your actions, in order that you may embellish the noble and conceal the shameful.” The immediately following entry, no. 13, is a saying attributed to Chilo: “When asked what is most difficult, Chilo said, ‘To know oneself, for each person, on account of self-love, attributes to himself many things.’” Both Bias and Chilo belong to the traditional Seven Sages. Chilo is named in the preceding text, i.e., no. 12 = 738.

The three entries, no. 11–13, differ in format. No. 11 begins with the attribution: Bias is named in genitive case. There follows the injunction to observe one’s actions followed by an explanation, presented in the form of a purpose clause (ἵνα, “in order that”). No. 13 is like no. 11 in that it begins with the attribution: Chilo is named in the genitive, and an explanation is provided (γάρ, “for”). But now the speaker’s words are given context, albeit minimal. He is made to respond to a question, which is not true of no. 11. Text no. 12 = 738 is different from both no. 11 and no. 13 in that it does not begin with an attribution and does not offer an explanation. Rather, it begins with the saying itself, which is said to be taken or understood as a proverb. We are then told that Theophrastus bears witness in his work *On Proverbs* (727 no. 14). Finally we are told that most people (think/say) that the apophthegm belongs to Chilo, but Clearchus (thinks/says) that it was said by the god to Chilo. The structure of the entry is straightforward. There is a first part that concerns the classification of “Know yourself” as a proverb. Theophrastus is cited as a witness. There is a second part, in which the saying “Know yourself” is referred to an individual. The many attribute it to Chilo, and Clearchus attributes it to the god, who said it to Chilo. The god is certainly Apollo,²³⁶ and the introduction of Clearchus is in line with his known interest in proverbs about which he wrote a work entitled *On Proverbs*.²³⁷

As already mentioned in the discussion of text 737, Rupprecht, Kindstrand, Tosi and Dorandi all argue that texts 737 and 738 prove that Theophrastus made an advance over Aristotle by distinguishing between a παροιμία and an ἀπόφθεγμα, a “proverb” and a “saying.” In the preceding comment on 737, I suggested that 737, taken by itself, does little to support the view of the four scholars. Here I want to suggest that the same can be said concerning 738. Taken by itself, the text divides into two parts of which only the

²³⁶ The god is Apollo. According to Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 10.24.1, “Know yourself” and “Nothing in excess” were inscribed in the forecourt of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi.

²³⁷ See above, Chapter II on “Titles of Books” no. 14 pp. 125–126.

first refers to Theophrastus. We read that in his work *On Proverbs*, “Know yourself” is taken as a proverb, *παροιμία*. That is unexciting and tells us nothing about how Theophrastus might have distinguished between *ἀποφθέγματα* and *παροιμιαί*. The second part does use *ἀπόφθεγμα* in reference to “Know yourself,” but neither Theophrastus nor his work is mentioned. To be sure, we have translated the initial *δέ* (*οἱ πολλοὶ δέ*) with “but,” and that links the second part of 738 to the first part. It suggests that the second part of the text is in some way opposed to the first part.²³⁸ And it is, but the contrast is not between Theophrastus’ understanding of *παροιμία* and his understanding of *ἀπόφθεγμα*. Rather it is between Theophrastus, who understood “Know yourself” as a proverb, and other persons (*οἱ πολλοί* and *Κλέαρχος*), who took it to be an apophthegm attributable to either Chilo or to the god who said it to Chilo. Moreover, we are not to believe that Stobaeus is drawing on Theophrastus directly, and there is no strong reason to believe that what is said in the second part ultimately goes back to Theophrastus. An intermediate source may have combined Theophrastean material with material drawn from elsewhere and in doing so is likely not to have concerned himself with how the second head of the Peripatetic School distinguished between *παροιμιαί* and *ἀποφθέγματα*.

It still might be argued that 738 and 737 taken together prove that Theophrastus did distinguish between an *ἀπόφθεγμα* and a *παροιμία*. In 738 we are told that in his work *Περὶ παροιμιῶν* Theophrastus treated the saying “Know yourself” as a *παροιμία*. And in 737 we are told that in the same work Theophrastus treated “Rule reveals the man” as an *ἀπόφθεγμα*. The fact that in one and same work carrying the title *Περὶ παροιμιῶν*, Theophrastus used both terms *ἀπόφθεγμα* and *παροιμία* shows that he distinguished between them. I can agree with that as long as it is not claimed that Theophrastus was doing something noteworthy that set him apart from Aristotle. As I see it, 737 and 738 establish or at least strongly suggest that 1) Theophrastus used *παροιμία* in reference to sayings that had entered the public domain and enjoyed special respect, perhaps due to their perceived antiquity.²³⁹ And 2) he used

²³⁸ While I think the translation correct, I want to acknowledge that someone might argue that the initial *δέ* is continuative and not adversative. See LSJ s.v. and J. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1966) p. 162.

²³⁹ The idea that proverbs are fragments of philosophy left over after widespread destruction fits well with proverbs conceived of as ancient and therefore anonymous sayings that express truths succinctly. See above, the introduction to this section on “Proverbs” pp. 199–200 on Synesius, *Encomium of Baldness* 22 = Aristotle fr. 13 Rose³. At the beginning of his extensive study of the proverb “Know yourself” (*Connais-toi toi meme* [Paris: Études August-

ἀπόφθεγμα inclusively for a saying that might or might not be viewed as παροιμία. In other words, like Aristotle and most Peripatetics, Theophrastus understood ἀπόφθεγμα in such a way that it could be used of sayings in general.²⁴⁰ We would like to know whether Theophrastus ever attempted to spell out the criteria that must be met for a saying to be called a παροιμία. My guess is that he did not. He simply embraced ordinary language and used παροιμία and ἀπόφθεγμα accordingly.

A passage in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, already referred to above,²⁴¹ is of interest in regard to "Know yourself." I am thinking of *Rhetoric* 2.21, in which Aristotle recommends using maxims that contradict sayings that have entered the public domain, when doing so enhances the speaker's character or adds emotion to what is being said. As an example of expressing emotion, Aristotle cites the angry man who calls the injunction "Know yourself" mistaken, and then explains, "At least this man, if he knew himself, would not have thought himself worthy of being a general" (1395a23–26). The explanation is an ironic expression of anger; it is also clever in that it actually points up the importance of knowing one's own abilities. For a different example, I cite a text included by Stobaeus in his chapter "On the (saying) Know yourself." It runs, "In many respects 'Know yourself' is not well stated, for 'Know the others' is more useful" (no. 5 p. 557.3–5). The example is drawn from a lost play²⁴² of Menander, who was Theophrastus' pupil and a writer

tinienne 1974] p. 11), Pierre Courcelle tells us that the continuous interest in the proverb from antiquity onwards was not due to the fame of its author, for the name of the author was unknown. Courcelle goes on to cite a string of individuals, beginning with the god Apollo and including Chilo, to whom the proverb was at one time or another attributed.

²⁴⁰ For an inclusive use of ἀπόφθεγμα by a Peripatetic contemporary with Theophrastus, I cite Stobaeus' *Anthology*, where various sayings are attributed to seven persons under the heading Δημητρίου Φαληρέως τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα, "*Sayings of the Seven Sages* by Demetrius of Phalerum" (3.1.172 [p. 111.8–9 Hense] = Demetrius fr. 114 Wehrli = fr. 87.1 Stork; already mentioned above in Chapter III "The Titles" no. 12 p. 117; Wehrli prints only the heading [p. 26], and for the text he refers to Hense's edition of Stobaeus 3 [p. 69]). In the heading, the word translated with "sayings" is ἀποφθέγματα, and in what follows seven Sages are named, each of which is reported to have said, ἔφη, various things. There is no mention of παροιμίαι, but the sayings listed include sayings that are regularly viewed as proverbs. Notable are "Nothing in excess" and "Know yourself," each of which enjoys pride of place in its list: the former takes precedence in the list of ἀποφθέγματα assigned to Solon (p. 114. 6 H = fr. 87.21 S) and the latter comes first in the list assigned to Chilo (p. 116.2 H. = fr. 87.35 S).

²⁴¹ In the introduction to this section on "Proverbs" pp. 198–199.

²⁴² Stobaeus reports the title of the play: Θρασυλέων (vol. 3 p. 557.2 Hense), which would be a suitable name for someone who is bold or rash and hence would do well to heed the proverb "Know yourself." Julian, *Misopogon* 349C associates the name Thrasyleon with a foolish soldier, στρατιώτης ἀνόητος.

of New Comedy (fr. 240 vol. 3 p. 69 Kock = fr. 181 *PCG* vol. 6.2 p. 133 Kassel-Austin). Theophrastus would not reject outright the words written by his pupil, but most likely he would recommend changing “many respects” to “some respects,” and most certainly he would want to emphasize the particular situation, in which a person finds himself.²⁴³ E.g., in a crowded place, it may be more useful to know the character of the other people, for one or more of those present may be hostile and apt to cause harm. To acknowledge that is not to discount as foolish the proverb “Know yourself.” Rather, it is being practical, i.e., recognizing that there are circumstances in which knowing others can be (hugely) beneficial.

A different quotation recorded by Stobaeus runs: “If you are mortal, my good man, also think things mortal” (no. 4 p. 557.1). The words are from a lost play of Antiphanes, a writer of Middle Comedy (fr. 289 vol. 2 p. 127 Kock = fr. 282 *PCG* vol. 2 p. 469 Kassel-Austin), who was a contemporary of Theophrastus and somewhat older than Menander. What interests me here is that Aristotle, in Book 10 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, takes issue with the idea that mortals should limit themselves to thinking things mortal. He tells us that we ought not to follow those who advise us, since we are human, to think things human, and being mortal, to think things mortal. Instead, we should be immortal as far as possible and do everything in accordance with our best part (10.7 1177b31–34). That best part is intelligence, νοῦς, which is something divine within us (1177b28–31). Theophrastus would agree (see *Commentary* 6.1 [2011] pp. 377–381, 393–405). Here the injunction to know oneself takes on added importance. The best life is achieved by those who know that they are gifted with intellect and therefore capable of enjoying the superior pleasures of contemplation.

Closely related to 738 is text 483. It is taken from an oration of Julian (*Orations* 9[6].5 185A–B [CB vol. 2.1 p. 149.21–150.3 Rochefort]) and runs as follows:

οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν ἐν Δελφοῖς θεὸς τὸ γνῶθι σαυτὸν προσαγορεύει, Ἡράκλειτος δὲ “ἐδιζή-
σάμην ἐμεωυτὸν,” ἀλλὰ καὶ Πυθαγόρας οἱ τε ἅπ’ ἐκείνου μέχρι Θεοφράστου τὸ κατὰ
δύναμιν ὁμοιοῦσθαι θεῷ φασι, καὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης. ὁ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ποτέ, τοῦτο ὁ
θεὸς αἶει.

Therefore, the god at Delphi proclaims, “Know yourself,” and Heraclitus, “I searched myself.” Further Pythagoras and those who came after him down to Theophrastus speak of likening oneself as far as possible to God; yes, and Aristotle (does so) too. For what we are sometimes, God always is.

²⁴³ Since Menander’s play has been lost, we cannot know the context in which a stage figure spoke of knowing others as more useful.

483 is like 738 in that it concerns the phrase “Know yourself.” In addition, both texts make reference to the god, i.e., the Delphic Apollo, both mention Theophrastus and both may be regarded as dividing into two parts.²⁴⁴ There are, however, differences. Most important is that 738 is focused on “Know yourself” as a well-known expression, while 438 is focused on the phrase as a directive or injunction. I begin with the first part of each text. 738 tells us that the phrase is understood as a proverb and then cites Theophrastus as a witness. His work *On Proverbs* is referred to by title. In contrast, 483 begins with the god at Delphi addressing an unspecified listener, after which reference is made to Heraclitus, who said, “I searched myself.” In other words, “Know yourself” is understood to be an injunction directed at individuals, and Heraclitus is cited as an example of an individual who responded properly by engaging in self-examination. The second half of 738 concerns competing attributions: we are told that most people think that the saying belongs to Chilo, but Clearchus thinks that Chilo heard the god say, “Know yourself.” The second half of 483 has nothing to do with competing attributions. Rather, the injunction is explained by reference to Pythagoras and others down to Theophrastus, who speak of likening oneself as far as possible to god. In addition, Aristotle is cited for saying what we are sometimes god is at all times. We are to understand that a man’s intellect is his most divine part and that it makes possible a life similar to that of the gods. It follows that the man who truly knows himself will not fail to choose such a life. (See *Commentary* 6.1 [2011] pp. 398–402 on 483.)

738.5 NEW: Scholium on Euripides’ *Hippolytus* 265 (vol. 2 p. 39.3–8 Schwartz)

Literature: Lichtenberg (1902–1909) col. 2514–2515; Hanslik (1950) col. 1874–1875; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 5 p. 42, 84; Fortenbaugh (2011) pp. 316–319

In 1992 when the text-translation volumes were first published and again in 1993 when they were reprinted with corrections, text 738.5 was not known to us and therefore is missing in the text-translation volumes. If and when there is a second edition, then 738.5 should be printed in the section on “Miscellaneous Items,” toward the end of the texts on “Proverbs,” after 738 and before the new reference to 710 and the existing reference to 624. Since

²⁴⁴ 483.1–2 (οὐκοῦν—ἐμεωυτόν) and 2–4 (ἀλλὰ—ἄει); 738.1–2 (γνώθι—παροιμίων) and 2–3 (οἱ πολλοί—Χεῖλωνι).

738.5 is relevant to ethics and in particular to the doctrine of the mean, a reference to 738.5 should be placed in the section on “Virtue and Vice” after text 449B. Text 738.5 has already been discussed in *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) pp. 316–319. Here I shall not hesitate to repeat much of what is said in the earlier commentary,²⁴⁵ while adding new material and making a significant correction.²⁴⁶

The text of the scholium runs as follows:

Τὸ μηδὲν ἄγαν οἱ μὲν Χίλωνι τῷ Λακεδαιμονίῳ ἀνατιθέασιν, ὡς Κριτίας, οἱ δὲ Σωδάμῳ, ὡς τὸ ἐν Τεγέᾳ ἐπιγράμμα δηλοῖ·

ταῦτ' ἔλεγεν Σωδάμος Ἐπηράτου, ὅς μ' ἀνέθηκεν
μηδὲν ἄγαν, καιρῷ πάντα πρόσσεστι καλά.

ὁ δὲ Θεόφραστος, ὡς τὰ Σισύφου λεγόμενα καὶ Πιτθέως, οἶον μηδὲν ἄγαν, μηδὲ δίκαν δικάσης.

Some assign “Nothing in excess” to the Spartan Chilo, as Critias does, but others assign it to Sodamus, as the inscription in Tegea shows:

Eperatus' son, Sodamus, who put me up, said the following:

“Nothing in excess,” “All that is noble is timely.”

And Theophrastus (understood?), as things said by Sisyphus and Pittheus, e.g., “Nothing in excess,” “Do not judge a lawsuit.”²⁴⁷

The scholion is a comment on the penultimate line of a speech by Phaedra's Nurse early in the *Hippolytus* (250–266). At the time of the Nurse's speech, Phaedra is in a state of extreme misery on account of her repressed lust for Hippolytus. The Nurse, who does not understand what is wrong with Phaedra, speaks of the pain that she herself feels as a result of her affection for Phaedra.²⁴⁸ She has made the general point that affection should be kept moderate and not be allowed to reach the extreme marrow of the soul (253–255). Her closing words reinforce the point: οὕτω τὸ λίαν

²⁴⁵ Throughout this note, I am indebted to Stefan Schorn for his helpful observations.

²⁴⁶ See the immediately following note.

²⁴⁷ In *Commentary* 6.1, I erred badly when I understood δικάσης to be a second aorist in the middle voice and translated the words μηδὲ δίκαν δικάσης with “Do not go to law.” Rather, δικάσης is a first aorist in the active voice. Together with μή and its compounds, the aorist subjunctive is used commonly to express prohibition (Goodwin's Greek Grammar p. 287 no. 1346). Hence the translation of μηδὲ δίκαν δικάσης ought to be: “Do not judge a lawsuit.” A single codex (M) reads μηδὲν διώκειν δέκσης.

²⁴⁸ W. Barrett, *Euripides, Hippolytus* (Oxford: Clarendon 1964) pp. 209–210 emphasizes that the Nurse speaks of her affection, φιλία. Sexual desire, ἔρως, is Phaedra's problem and not the focus of the Nurse's remarks.

ἥσσον ἐπαινῶ | τοῦ μηδὲν ἄγαν. | καὶ ξυμφήσουσι σοφοί μοι, “Thus I praise the extreme less than nothing in excess. And the wise will agree with me” (264–266).

The scholium concerns the well-known phrase or saying μηδὲν ἄγαν, “Nothing in excess” (265).²⁴⁹ In the first part of the scholium (which includes the distich),²⁵⁰ we are told that some people attribute the saying to Chilo²⁵¹ and others to Sodamus. In regard to Chilo, Critias is cited. In regard to Sodamus, an epigram/inscription is quoted, in which Sodamus states that he has put up the inscription and said what follows (ταῦτ’ ἔλεγεν). As Wehrli points out, the inscription does not support the idea that Sodamus originated the two sayings that follow. He merely said them, presumably in a positive way.²⁵² The first of the two sayings is the special concern of the scholiast. The second introduces a new piece of wisdom, “All that is noble is timely.”²⁵³ One can make a connection with “Nothing in excess”—what counts as excess often depends on the particular situation, and there are times when excess (now understood as unusually large or frequent) is desirable²⁵⁴—but such connections do not explain why the scholiast quoted the second saying, when the first is the focus of his attention. The explanation is obvious. The second saying is part of the inscription, which the scholiast has chosen to quote in full.

In the second part of the scholium, Theophrastus alone is named as a source for the attribution of two sayings to Sisyphus and Pittheus. Once again we have “Nothing in excess.” while “Do not judge a lawsuit” is new. The first is, of course, the focus of the scholium, but this time it is not clear

²⁴⁹ In *Rhetoric* 2.21 1395a21–22, Aristotle places “Nothing in excess” among sayings that have become public property, δεδημοσιευμένα. Hence, the saying might be classified as a proverb or adage.

²⁵⁰ In regard to content, the intial prose part and the distich may be regarded as one part joined by references to Sodamus. The second part begins with a reference to Theophrastus. Both parts are concerned with the saying “Nothing in excess” and an additional saying that is not the same in the two parts. In regard to style, the scholium divides into three parts. The first is in prose; second comes a distich; the third returns to prose. Physically the distich took the form of an inscription that was erected by a man named Sodamus.

²⁵¹ The proverb “Know yourself” was also attributed to Chilo (738). When the originator of a proverb was sought, Chilo, as one of the Seven Sages, was a ready candidate.

²⁵² Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 5 p. 84.

²⁵³ The idea that virtuous, noble action is timely, i.e., suits the particular occasion, is recognized by Aristotle and Theophrastus. On the latter, see e.g., 449A.30.

²⁵⁴ In *Rhetoric* 2.21, Aristotle cites “Nothing in excess” as an example of a proverbial expression that one might contradict in order to manifest superior character: οὐδὲ τὸ μηδὲν ἄγαν· δεῖ γὰρ τοὺς γε καχοὺς ἄγαν μισεῖν, “Not (as the proverb says) ‘Nothing in excess,’ for at least vicious persons ought to be the object of extreme hate” (1395a32–33).

why the second is added. Indeed, it seems to be a very odd saying unless we imagine that it is directed at someone who is for one reason or another unqualified to function as a judge. But that line of reasoning is not to be followed, for there is a better way to resolve the problem. The saying as recorded by the scholiast is incomplete. In the pseudo-Platonic *Demodocus* 383C, we find the saying in its full form: μηδὲ δίκην δικάσης, πρὶν ἀμφοῖν μῦθον ἀκούσης, “Do not judge a lawsuit, until you have heard both sides.” With only minor variation (ἄμφω instead of ἀμφοῖν), the full saying is found in Plutarch’s *Stoic Self-Contradictions* 8 1034E. And in both authors, we find the Attic form δίκην instead of δίκαν, which is Doric and found in the scholium. That, too, may be deemed a minor variation, but it is also of interest in that the Doric form suits persons living in Corinth and Troezen, i.e., Sisyphus and Pittheus, to whom the saying is attributed.

In the second part, the two sayings are introduced by οἷον, “such as/e.g.,” which seems appropriate to examples. But examples of what? The sorts of sayings that are attributed to Sisyphus and Pittheus? That seems odd in regard to Sisyphus, who was a legendary trickster, best known for his punishment in Hades. He was required to push a large stone up hill only to have it roll back down and so on without end. To be sure, there is a more serious side to Sisyphus. He was considered the founder and king of Corinth,²⁵⁵ and as such he had a shrine on the Acrocorinthus and a grave on the Isthmus. But would Theophrastus pick him out as the (real) author of either of the two sayings? That strikes me as improbable, though Theophrastus might have mentioned him in a survey of sayings that are movable and attributed to various ancients with little concern for historical correctness.

Less puzzling is Pittheus. He is said to have been the son of Pelops, king of Troezen and grandfather of Theseus. Plutarch tells us that Pittheus enjoyed an outstanding reputation as a person skilled in words and exceptional in wisdom: λόγιος and σοφώτατος. Indeed, Plutarch in the *Life of Theseus* cites Aristotle, who reported that a sententious verse in Hesiod’s *Works and Days* was attributed to Pittheus: “Let the promised payment to a man who is a friend be sure/sufficient” (3.2, citing *WD* 370 = Aristotle, fr. 598 R³). The saying fits Pittheus well, in that he was active as a judge (three white marble

²⁵⁵ In the *Iliad* 6.152–154, Homer says that Sisyphus lived in Ephyre in the corner of Horse-pasturing Argos, i.e., in the northeast corner of the Peloponnese (not on the western coast of Greece south of Corcyra). In antiquity the city was identified with Corinth. See E. Bethe, “Sisyphos” in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 3A1 (1927) col. 372–373.

seats at his grave site are said to record the fact [Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 2.31.3]), and the same is true of the second saying quoted in the scholium, once it is given in full. In general, a judge ought to withhold judgment until he has heard both sides.²⁵⁶

A problem remains: if the full saying included the words “until you have heard both sides,” why has the scholiast omitted these words? One possibility is that his source omitted them. But that only “kicks the can down the road.” Why then did his source omit them? Or did Theophrastus omit them? One possibility is that the responsible person considered the saying so well-known that there was no need to report the saying in full.²⁵⁷ His readers would take pleasure in filling out the saying.²⁵⁸ But there is a further possibility suggested to me by Stefan Schorn: when the scholion was first written in the margin of a manuscript of Euripides’ *Medea*, the scholiast ran out of room and left the saying incomplete. Or do we have a case mindless copying, i.e., a scholiast who nodded and omitted the second half of the saying? But however the omission got started, it was repeated so that it occurs in at least four different codices.²⁵⁹

Problematic as the scholium may be, we should not doubt that Theophrastus took seriously the saying “Nothing in excess.” He will have known Euripides’ depiction of Phaedra as a woman overcome by excessive sexual desire, and he is reported to have defined love/lust, ἔρως, as an excess of a certain irrational desire (557.1). Similarly with affection, φιλία, he will have known Euripides’ depiction of Phaedra’s Nurse and accepted her misery as a realistic depiction of what happens when one person becomes too emotionally entangled with another. Moreover, he knew that excessive affection can have quite different results. It can, for example, lead to anger, when a person thinks that he has been honored in a less than appropriate manner (542.7–10). Indeed, there can be no doubt that Theophrastus, who adopted

²⁵⁶ For a challenge to the saying by Zeno, see Plutarch, *Stoic Self-Contradictions* 8 1034E–F.

²⁵⁷ The antiquity of the saying is not in doubt. It occurs in Aristophanes’ *Wasps* 725–726, where it is attributed to someone wise. In a letter to Atticus (7.18.4), Cicero calls the saying pseudo-Hesiodic. In their edition of the *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (pp. 168–169), R. Merkelbach and M.L. West include the saying among the unplaced fragments. In the Loeb edition (2007 pp. 348–351), G. Most places it among the doubtful fragments. Whatever the origin may have been, the saying was part of the established tradition, so that Aristophanes can speak simply of someone wise, σοφός (*loc. cit.*) and Plutarch of the man who said, τὸν εἰπόντα (*Stoic Self-Contradictions* 8 1034E). In such a case, a person can omit a portion of the saying and expect his readers or listeners to add it for themselves.

²⁵⁸ See above, p.188 n. 157.

²⁵⁹ Dindorf (1863) vol. 1 p. 112 and Schwartz (1891) vol. 2 p. 39.

Aristotle's doctrine of the mean (449A.1–32), understood the wisdom conveyed by “Nothing in excess.”

Finally, we might ask where Theophrastus expressed himself concerning the sayings reported in the second part of the scholium. An obvious guess is the work *On Proverbs* (727 no. 14). Theophrastus, like Aristotle, knew that Pittheus was regarded as a source of traditional wisdom and may well have cited him, perhaps together with Sisyphus, in a work that dealt with sayings that had become public property.²⁶⁰ And on such an occasion he may have mentioned not only “Nothing in excess” but also “Do not judge a lawsuit, until you have heard both sides.” Perhaps less likely but still possible is that Theophrastus cited Pittheus along with one or both of the sayings in the work *On the Wise Men* (727 no. 12), for it is not certain that this work focused exclusively on the Seven Sages.

710 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 8.40 347F–348A (*BT* vol. 2 p. 263.5–18 Kaibel)

Literature: Schweighäuser (1801–1805) vol. 4 pp. 585–586; Arndt (1904) p. 15; Mittelhaus (1911) p. 49; Regenbogen (1940) col. 1524; Strömberg (1954) p. 85; Wehrli (1967–1974) vol. 3 p. 73; Janko (1984) p. 48, 210–211; Rabbie (1986) pp. xliii–iv; Tosi (1994) pp. 180–181; Gilula (2000) 423–424, 427, 585; Fortenbaugh (2005) pp. 376–390, (2011) p. 328

In the text-translation volumes, text 710 is printed in the section on “Rhetoric and Poetics” under the heading “The Ludicrous” (vol. 2 pp. 556–557). It has been discussed at some length in *Commentary* vol. 8 (2005) on rhetoric and poetics pp. 376–394. I am discussing it here because of its focus on an interesting proverb that both Clearchus (fr. 80 Wehrli) and Theophrastus explained in a similar but not identical manner.²⁶¹

710 is found in Athenaeus' *The Sophists at Dinner* 8.40 347F–348A. The speaker is the Cynic Cynulcus, who is irritated with Ulpian and asks how he (Ulpian) can understand what Stratoniceus said in regard to Propis the cithara-singer. Cynulcus then cites Clearchus who said in his work *On Proverbs* that Stratoniceus observed Propis to be large in stature, but in his skill bad and smaller than his body. And when asked what sort of person Propis might be, Stratoniceus replied οὐδεὶς κακὸς μέγας ἰχθύς, “No bad fish is large,”

²⁶⁰ On “public property,” see the introduction to this section pp. 198–199.

²⁶¹ In his collection of Clearchan texts, Wehrli does not include the Theophrastean material that follows immediately on the Clearchan. We have included both in 710.

thereby intimating that Ulpian was first a nobody, that he was bad and large, but a fish on account of his lack of voice. What especially interests me here is the word “intimating,” ἀνισσόμενος. The Greek verb is used of “speaking in riddles” (LSJ s.v.). Clearchus wrote a separate work *On Riddles*, Περὶ γρίφων (fr. 84–95b W) and will have understood that the meaning of a proverb may not be immediately clear. That can be the result of concision and metaphor. The proverb in question is concise, being only four words long, and it has been transferred from a rotten fish to a voiceless human being.

In what follows, Cynulcus turns to Theophrastus and cites his work *On the Ludicrous*. We are told that Theophrastus reported that the proverb was said by Stratonicus, but directed at Simycas the actor (not at Propis the cithara-singer). In addition, Stratonicus is said to have spoken the words separately, replacing “bad” with “rotten” and using a slightly different word order: μέγας οὐδεις σαπρὸς ἰχθύς, “No rotten fish is large.”²⁶² Within the proverb itself, the word “rotten” is more precise than “bad.” Left too long on the beach or in the bottom of boat, a fish will begin to rot and no longer be good for eating. But when the proverb is applied to a human being, then a person hearing the proverb for the first time may wonder how to construe “rotten fish.” Of course, the reader of Athenaeus may have no trouble. Since he has already been told that Propis was a fish because of his lack of voice, he will construe Simycas’ deficiency as one of voice: the actor was unable to project his voice so that the audience had difficulty hearing him. But a person hearing the proverb in the agora and lacking background (not understanding the situation) is likely to be puzzled. We might say that he is confronted by a quasi-riddle that requires further information if it is to be solved.

Finally, it is worth noting that the proverb as recorded by Theophrastus provides a clue to its origin. The proverb began in a fish market when someone refused to purchase a large fish on the grounds that it was rotten. In doing so, he expressed his disgust by saying “No bad/rotten fish is large.” These words were overheard and were repeated by others in the market. Eventually they gained currency in fish markets around the coasts of Greece and ultimately began to be used of things other than fish. In this case, there was a first person with whom the proverb originated. He was probably an ordinary fisherman who had a sense of humor. His name was quickly forgotten, so that the proverb became anonymous in short time. No overwhelming flood or other form of destruction was needed to account for

²⁶² Here, as above, the translation does not imitate the order of the Greek words.

anonymity.²⁶³ But of the many users of the proverb, some will have been well-known and one or two will have used the proverb in an especially memorable manner. Stratonicus is an example. He was an accomplished cithara-player, who is credited with several firsts in his profession.²⁶⁴ He is also credited with an ability to make witty remarks. Phantias, a Peripatetic and Theophrastus' fellow Eresian, describes Stratonicus as not unconvincing in regard to the ludicrous.²⁶⁵ Apparently Stratonicus used the proverb in such a humorous and mocking manner that his name became attached to it. Fair enough, but a caveat is in order. Witty sayings are like attributions of discovery: they are movable.²⁶⁶ In the absence of strong documentation, they are readily associated with more than one person, especially someone well-known for his wit. It is possible that Stratonicus' reputation for witty remarks encouraged persons who were interested in wit to assign to Stratonicus the proverb involving "big fish." Or perhaps Stratonicus did use the proverb to insult Propis but not Simycas. A later collector of Stratonicus' clever sayings may have added Simycas to the persons targeted by Stratonicus. Or the other way around: Simycas was targeted and Propis added later. Be that as it may, it is clear that we should keep separate the originator and the users of a particular proverb and recognize not only that a given proverb was used by many different persons (that is characteristic of a proverb) but also that proverbs could be and undoubtedly were attributed to persons who never used them, at least not in the way relevant to the attribution.

624 Plutarch, *Greek Questions* 42 301C (*BT* vol. 2 p. 358.20–29 Tichener)

Literature: Müller (1841–1870) vol. 4 p. 650; Halliday (1928) pp. 179–180; Ziegler (1951) col. 225; Mirhady (1992) pp. 155–156; Boulogne (2002) p. 419

In the text-translation volumes, text 624 has been printed among the political texts under the heading "Generals," for it concerns a powerful general named Deinon. The text is also concerned with the origin of a particular proverb, and for that reason it is referred to later in the text-translation

²⁶³ See the introduction to this section, above pp. 199–200 on Aristotle, fragment 13 Rose³.

²⁶⁴ Stratonicus is credited with introducing multiplicity of notes, being first to accept students of harmony and to compile a table of musical intervals (Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 8 352C).

²⁶⁵ Athenaeus 8.46 352C = Phantias, fr. 32 Wehrli = fr. 38 Engels.

²⁶⁶ In regard to discoveries, I cite the potter's wheel, which was attributed to Hyperbius, Talos and Anarchasis. See above pp. 174–175.

volumes at the end of the section on “Proverbs” within the collection of “Miscellaneous Items.”²⁶⁷ Hence 624 is being discussed here and will be discussed independently by David Mirhady in *Commentary* 7 on the political texts.

Text 624 is taken from Plutarch’s *Greek Questions*, a collection of 59 short texts that are independent of each other.²⁶⁸ In each case a question is put and an answer or explanation follows. Our special concern is no. 42. Plutarch puts the question: ἀπὸ τίνος ἐρρήθη τὸ παροιμιῶδες “αὐτὰ κυρία”; “What is the source of the proverbial saying ‘This is valid’?” and then offers an answer in two parts.

In the first part, Plutarch introduces Deinon the Tarentine, who is characterized in the following manner: στρατηγῶν, ἀνὴρ δ’ ὢν ἀγαθὸς ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς, “acting as general (holding the office of στρατηγός) and being a good man in military matters” (lines).²⁶⁹ Two problems arise. The first concerns the name Deinon. The manuscripts read Δίνων, which we have printed in the text-translation volumes. Crönert conjectured Δείνων, which is printed by Babbitt in the Loeb and by Boulogne in the Budé. The emendation is not a matter of whim. A diphthong like εἰ was subject to iotacism: reflecting a change in pronunciation, a plain iota was substituted for the digraph. The name Δείνων will not have been an exception. A copyist, perhaps working from dictation, will have made the change from εἰ to ι, and that change became part of the manuscript tradition.²⁷⁰ Our decision to stay with the manuscript reading now seems to me questionable, even a mistake.²⁷¹ At very least we should have recorded Crönert’s conjecture in the critical

²⁶⁷ If a reference to 549 is added after that to 624 (as will be recommended below), then the reference to 624 will not be at the end of the section but rather in the penultimate position.

²⁶⁸ For brief remarks on Plutarch’s *Greek Questions*, see Chapter II “The Sources” no. 3.

²⁶⁹ I have added in parentheses the phrase “holding the office of στρατηγός” to make clear that Deinon was an elected official of Tarentum. We may compare Aelian, *Miscellaneous History* 7.14, where the question is put “Were not philosophers good in military matters?” In the response that follows, pride of place is given to a more famous Tarentine, Archytas, the Pythagorean philosopher and contemporary of Plato. The Tarentines, we are told, chose or elected, εἵλοντο, Archytas στρατηγός six times. On the election of officials in Tarentum, see below on Aristotle, *Politics* 6.5 1320b9–14.

²⁷⁰ Here and throughout this comment, I am grateful to Eckart Schütrumpf for helpful criticism.

²⁷¹ In *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. IIIA: The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia, ed. P. Fraser and E. Matthews (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1997) p. 119, the Tarentine of 624 is listed under Δείνων. There are thirty-two entries in all. The name Δίνων is not recognized.

apparatus. Moreover, since we chose to translate the name with a diphthong, it would have been consistent to have printed Δείνων in the Greek text.²⁷²

The second problem concerns the identity of the Deinon referred to in 624. To my knowledge, a Tarentine general named Deinon is mentioned nowhere else in ancient literature. Given the paucity of our sources that may seem trivial, but the name Deinon might be thought contrived. For Δείνων suggests δεινός, “fearsome” or “terrible,” and therefore is well suited to a general, who is described as “good in military matters” (line 2) and will soon be depicted as challenging a vote of the assembly that has been reported by a herald and gone against the general’s wishes (lines 2–4). That might seem too good to be true, but it hardly proves that the anecdote told in 624 has no basis in history. Deinon was not an unusual name,²⁷³ and being all too appropriate does happen. Theophrastus is an example. His name suggests a divine manner of speaking and fits a philosopher who took a keen interest in rhetoric and was repeatedly praised for his pleasing mode of expression.²⁷⁴ Indeed, we are told that Theophrastus was originally called Tyrtamus, and that Aristotle changed his name on account of the divine character of his speech (1.30–31). But the story is not to be believed. Theophrastus was not a unique name,²⁷⁵ and neither was Deinon.

After the initial characterization of Deinon, Plutarch tells us that a proposal of Deinon was voted down by the citizens, and when the herald proclaimed the winning proposition, Deinon raised his right hand and said “this is stronger.” Plutarch adds that Theophrastus has reported the matter in this way, i.e., the way he (Plutarch) has related it (lines 2–5). Notable is the use of the Doric dialectic: α occurs where Attic would have η, not only in the proverb αὔτα κυρία but also in Deinon’s words ἄδε κρείσσων.²⁷⁶ That suits the Tarentines, for originally they were colonists sent out by the Lacedaemonians in 708 BC. Presumably the proverb was regularly cited in Doric and for that reason Theophrastus and Plutarch reported it in Doric.

The question put by Plutarch concerns the origin of the proverbial saying αὔτα κυρία, “This is valid.” The Greek phrase does not recur in the answer

²⁷² Halliday is consistent in that that he prints Δίνων (p. 32) and translates with “Dino” (p. 179).

²⁷³ See above, note 271.

²⁷⁴ Cicero frequently speaks well of Theophrastus’ style. See 5B.2, 50.1, 51.2–4, 52A.2–3, 52B.5, 53.4, 54.2 and 497.1.

²⁷⁵ Two eponymous archons named Theophrastus were contemporaries of the Peripatetic philosopher. See above, n. 135.

²⁷⁶ The double sigma in κρείσσων is often referred to as Ionic but it is also Doric.

that follows, and we are not told explicitly how the phrase is to be filled out, i.e., what noun is to be understood. Two possibilities come to mind: 1) γνῶμη, “motion” or “proposition.” And 2) χεῖρ, “hand.” The first is suggested by the fact that in what follows γνῶμη in the accusative case occurs with αὐτοῦ (his proposition, i.e., Deinon’s), and then in the herald’s proclamation it is understood with τὴν νικῶσαν (the winning proposition of the majority of the citizens). That might encourage understanding αὐτὰ κυρία as a traditional phrase referring to a winning proposition. Fair enough, but the second alternative is, I think, the better choice. For in what follows we are told that Deinon responded to the herald’s proclamation by raising his right hand and saying “This is stronger,” αὐτὸς ἀνατείνας τὴν δεξιάν, “ἄδε,” εἶπε, “κρείσσων.”²⁷⁷ Here χεῖρ in the accusative case is understood with δεξιάν, and the phrase ἄδε κρείσσων refers to Deinon’s raised right hand.²⁷⁸ We can imagine the hand held open as one might do when voting, or we can imagine a clenched fist, which would be appropriate to an expression of force intended to overturn a vote of the majority.²⁷⁹ Either way, by raising his hand and saying “This is stronger,” Deinon the general, who has been introduced as “good in military matters” (line 2), is indicating that his vote is authoritative, κυρία: it is efficacious and has the force of law. We might compare the English saying “Might makes right.” Only in 624, χεῖρ, “hand,” stands in for might and brings to the anecdote a concrete vividness that adds intensity.²⁸⁰

²⁷⁷ In private correspondence, Eckart Schütrumpf informs me that “in Athens men could comment after a vote, e.g. in order to make legal objections.” If the assembly in Tarentum recognized a similar right to speak after a vote had been taken, then by raising his hand, Deinon is raising the hand that had voted for the losing proposition, and by saying “This is valid,” Deinon declares his vote valid, despite the vote of the assembly as a whole. That is hardly a legal objection. Indeed, it makes mockery of the process, if the Tarentine assembly was organized along the lines of the Athenian assembly.

²⁷⁸ The demonstrative pronoun ὅδε generally refers to what is “near in place, time, or thought” (W. Goodwin and C. Gulick, *Greek Grammar* [1930] p. 216 no. 1004). In 624 ἄδε follows immediately upon τὴν δεξιάν (understand χεῖρα).

²⁷⁹ At one time, I was tempted to suggest understanding πυγμή, “fist,” in the accusative with δεξιάν, but χεῖρ is the obvious choice with δεξιάν. Moreover, χεῖρ occurs twice in the words χειροτονεῖν and χειροτονία (lines 2–3 and 7). In saying that I am not ruling out *imagining* a clenched fist held aloft. A menacing gesture is entirely appropriate, but in imagining a clenched fist, we would be going beyond what the text actually implies.

²⁸⁰ Eckart Schütrumpf has called my attention to χειροδικαί, “might (being their) right” in Hesiod, *Works and Days* 189. Cf. δίκη ἐν χειρὶ “right (will be) in might” in 192. In regard to Deinon *qua* general, Aristotle’s *Politics* 5.3 1285a10 seems especially apposite. Discussing the Spartan kings, Aristotle describes their kingship as a kind of military command and then speaks of ancient times when kings on a military expedition could kill a man ἐν χειρὸς νόμῳ, “by right of force.”

The second part of Plutarch's answer refers to Apollodorus, who is said to have added a report, *προσιστόρηκε*, in a work called *Rhutinios*, ἐν τῷ Πυτίνῳ (lines 5–6). The Greek title is corrupt, and in the text-translation volumes it has been placed in *crucis*.²⁸¹ There is no reason to doubt the name Apollodorus, but which Apollodorus is being referred to cannot be decided without additional evidence.²⁸² What follows is clear enough. The herald is reported to have said, αὐται πλείους, “These are more”. Deinon countered with ἀλλ’ αὐται βελτίους, “But these are better,” and ratified the vote of the minority (lines 6–7). The two phrases αὐται πλείους and αὐται βελτίους are feminine plural. Since the first part ended with Deinon raising his right hand, τὴν δεξιάν (χείρα), and asserting “This is stronger,” it is natural to understand χεῖρες, feminine plural, with αὐται in each of the two phrases. In another context, one might prefer to understand ψῆφοι, which is also feminine plural. The meaning would be the same, but the idea is not to be accepted, for it ignores not only the preceding reference to Deinon's hand but also the subsequent reference to voting by hand, χειροτονία (line 7). In addition, it would diminish the vividness and tension of the anecdote.²⁸³ The image of hands raised high would be lost as would the contrast between the hand of force and the hands of a democratic process.

When the two parts of Plutarch's answer are taken together, we have a good example of how a clever response can be added to a first response in a way that creates a kind of mini-drama. When the herald announced the winning proposition, Deinon responded by raising his hand and declaring it stronger. That might have been the end of matter (it is the end of the first part), but the herald chose to challenge Deinon, pointing out that the

²⁸¹ Babbitt's conjecture Ταραντίων is given in the *apparatus criticus*.

²⁸² Plutarch's text (both the first part and the second in which the name of Apollodorus occurs) is included in Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* vol. 4 p. 650 col. 2, but that does not tell us who this Apollodorus might be. The text is not included in Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Halliday p. 179 refers to the comic poet or the grammarian, presumably either Apollodorus of Gela or Apollodorus of Carystus, both comic poets (TLG 0411–0413 = CAF vol. 3 pp. 278–295 Kock = PCG vol. 2 pp. 485–516 Kassel-Austin), or Apollodorus of Athens, the grammarian and historian (TLG 0549 = FGrH 244). The piecing together of clever retorts might suggest a writer of comedy, but interest in repartee is too wide spread to decide the issue.

²⁸³ On χειροτονία and voting, see LSJ s.v. II.3. Plato, *Laws* 6 755D and 756B, πλείστη χειροτονία, may be compared with αὐται πλείους. *Laws* 2 659B has the plural χειροτονίαις, “by a show of hands.” To avoid any possible confusion, I note that in the final clause of the second part of 624: καὶ ἐπικυρώσαι τὴν τῶν ἐλαττόνων χειροτονίαν, “and (Deinon) ratified the vote of the minority” (line 7), the phrase τῶν ἐλαττόνων does not by itself refer to votes but rather to the minority of citizens, who voted for Deinon's motion.

winning proposition had more hands, i.e., votes. Deinon did not roll over. Rather, he declared his votes better and validated his own motion (end of the second part). Since Apollodorus is said to have added a report, προσιστόρηκε, i.e., added to what Theophrastus reported, it seems clear that Plutarch did not regard the second part as Theophrastean. And if the idea of adding a report can be pressed, then Apollodorus knew the Theophrastean report and made it his own by adding to it.

624 ends with Deinon validating the vote of the minority. There is no reason to think that the democratic constitution of Tarentum gave Deinon in his capacity as an elected general the authority to override a vote of the assembly. Rather, Deinon's act of validation will have been an exercise of power derived from his military connections and expertise. We are not told whether the validation lasted for a short or a long time. Nor are we taken back to the opening question, "What is the source of the proverbial saying, 'This is valid'?" We are forced to answer the question for ourselves, but given the anecdote the answer seems clear. The saying goes back to Deinon's cynical exercise of power and is applicable to cases in which force overrides proper procedure.

Earlier discussions have compared Deinon with Archytas (both were Tarentines and both held the office of στρατηγός) and taken note of the fact that Tarentum underwent a change in government soon after the Persian Wars. Previously it had been a polity,²⁸⁴ but when many of the leading citizens were killed in war with the Iapygians (473 BC),²⁸⁵ Tarentum became a democracy: not a radical democracy but one that exhibited moderation. According to Aristotle, the Tarentines created goodwill among the poor who were many by making property communal and by dividing the magistracies into those that were filled by election and those by lot. The latter guaranteed participation by the demos and the former ensured that public affairs would

²⁸⁴ Aristotle includes polity among the correct constitutions, because it is oriented properly, i.e., toward the good of the whole community. But he ranks polity third behind kingship and aristocracy, because the number of persons participating in the government is larger. Whereas a government of one, kingship, or a few, aristocracy, can be made up of excellent individuals, a government involving a large number of people, polity, will admit persons who fall short of excellence. Typically, those who fight for the state will be included. They may have a citizen's courage, but not full virtue involving both moral virtue and practical wisdom. See "Aristotle on Prior and Posterior, Correct and Mistaken Constitutions," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 106 (1976) pp. 125–137, repr. in *Aristotle's Practical Side* (Leiden: Brill 2006) pp. 125–137.

²⁸⁵ Aristotle, *Politics* 5.3 1303a4–7. On the date, see E. Schütrumpf, *Aristoteles, Politik, Buch IV–VI* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1996) p. 450.

be conducted in a better way: ἵνα πολιτεύωνται βέλτιον (*Politics* 6.5 1320b9–14).²⁸⁶ That invites comparison with what we read in Plutarch. I am thinking of Deinon's claim to have the better votes on his side. That is not a legal argument, and Deinon may not believe what he claims. His words may be little more than a cynical exhibition of "oneupmanship." Nevertheless, as an elected official (not chosen by lot) Deinon can claim to represent the better course of action, and in a city whose majority is marked by goodwill, he might expect or at least hope that he will get his way. That may be a bit of stretch, but it is striking that when the two parts of Plutarch's answer are taken together, we have a progression from an assertion of raw power to an assertion of better policy. That said, I do not want to withdraw the understanding of the proverb put forward in the previous paragraph. Rather, I want to suggest that 624 is an interesting text in that it combines brevity with complexity in a way that is not obvious on first reading.

Halliday pp. 179–180 and Boulogne p. 419 compare 624 with Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 3.5. 1232b6–7, where the topic is highmindedness (literally, greatness of soul, μεγαλοψυχία). Aristotle says that the highminded person cares more about the opinion of the good individual than that of the many ordinary people: μάλλον ἢ φροντίζειεν ἀνὴρ μεγαλόψυχος τί δοκεῖ ἐνὶ σπουδαίῳ ἢ πολλοῖς τοῖς τυγχάνουσιν. The statement is then illustrated by reference to Antiphon, who had defended himself in court and been condemned to death (411 BC, see Thucydides, *History* 8.68.1–2, where Antiphon is praised for his moral character and strength of intellect). When Agathon praised Antiphon's speech in self-defense, Antiphon replied in a way that agreed with Aristotle's characterization of the highminded man. The comparison of 624 with the Eudemian passage is apt. In both texts, there is a contrast between number and quality: the majority vs. the person/s of superior character and intelligence. And in both, there is a vote (one in the assembly and one in a court of law), in which the opinion of the better person/s is on the losing side. Only in 624 Deinon *qua* general overturns the vote of the assembly. In the case of Antiphon, Agathon's praise does not reverse the decision.

Although Plutarch cites no work of Theophrastus, the occurrence of τὸ παροιμιώδες, "the proverbial" in the first line suggests assigning 624.1–5 to *On Proverbs* (727 no. 14). But a political work cannot be excluded.

²⁸⁶ Schütrumpf (op. cit.) pp. 647–648 aptly compares ps.-Aristotle, *Rhetoric to Alexander* 2.14 1424a13–19.

549 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 12.31 526D (*BT* vol. 3 p. 161.23–25 Kaibel)

Literature: Schweighaeuser (1801–1805) vol. 11 pp. 408–409; Brandis (1860) p. 351; Wehrli (1967–1978) vol. 9 pp. 72–73; Fortenbaugh (1984) pp. 306–307, (2011) pp. 639–640

In the text-translation volumes, text 549 will be found among the ethical texts in the section on “Pleasure.” It has been discussed in *Commentary* 6.1 (2011) on ethics pp. 639–641. I return to it here, for the text is evidence of Theophrastus’ interest in proverbs. In any second edition of the text-translation volumes, a reference to 549 should be inserted at the end of the section on “Proverbs.”

549 is taken from Book 12 of Athenaeus’ *The Sophists at Dinner*. The book opens with Athenaeus addressing his friend Timocrates,²⁸⁷ who has been persistent in requesting that Athenaeus relate the discourse of the banqueters concerning persons who are notorious for living a life of luxury, τρυφή (510B). Athenaeus honors the request, beginning with the Persians (513E) and ending with the Cumaeans (528E). In the course of relating what was said, Athenaeus zeroes in on the Ionians. He quotes the comic poet Callias (or Diocles), who mocked all the Ionians, describing their land as luxurious and richly tabled: ἡ τρυφερὰ καὶ καλλιτράπεζος Ἰωνία (524F = fr. 5 vol. 1 p. 695 Kock = fr. 8 *PCG* vol. 4 p. 44). Also quoted is the comic poet Antiphanes, who is said to have spoken of all Ionians, when he described a crowd of luxuriantly dressed Ionians as delicate and eager for pleasure: ἢ τις Ἰώνων τρυφεραμπεχόνων ἀβρὸς ἡδυπαθῆς ὄχλος (526D = fr. 91 vol. 2 p. 48 Kock = fr. 91 *PCG* vol. 2 p. 360). Immediately thereafter Athenaeus introduces Theophrastus.

Θεόφρατος δ’ ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἡδονῆς καὶ δὴ καὶ τοὺς Ἰωνάς φησι διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς τρυφῆς * * * ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἡ χρυσὴ παροιμία διαμεμένηκε.

Theophrastus says in the (work) *On Pleasure* that indeed the Ionians on account of excessive luxury * * * and even now the golden proverb remains (in use).

The Greek text is marred by a lacuna, which Schweighäuser would fill with ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῇ παροιμίᾳ, “provided a starting-point for the proverb.” The supplement fits the context well. The luxurious manner of Ionian life is the focus of the immediately preceding words of Antiphanes, and “Ionian

²⁸⁷ In Book 12, Athenaeus drops the fiction of a banquet and speaks directly to Timocrates, who was not present at the banquet and had asked Athenaeus to tell him what had occurred at the banquet (12.1 510A–B).

luxury” was a well-known proverb that was inspired by the Ionian style of life.²⁸⁸ It is a reasonable guess that the clause διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς τρυφῆς, “on account of excessive luxury,” is making that very point: i.e., the golden proverb “Ionian luxury” arose because of the excessive luxury of the Ionians. The concluding words of the text tell us that the proverb remained in use. The adverb νῦν, “now,” refers to the time of Theophrastus, to which we might add “and long after him.”

The use of the noun ὑπερβολή, “excess” may be compared with the use of the noun in Theophrastus’ definition of eros: “An excess, ὑπερβολή, of irrational desire, whose coming is swift and parting slow” (557). Desire *per se* is not necessarily bad, but when it is quite irrational and quite unrestrained, then it becomes excessive, undesirable and even vicious. That recalls the proverb “Nothing in Excess” (738.5). Luxury is no exception. For examples of excessive luxury, I refer to Smindyrides and Sardanapulus, whose embrace of luxury is mentioned in 550 and 551.²⁸⁹

Theophrastus wrote a work *On Proverbs* (727 no. 14), but our text, 549, refers to *On Pleasure* (436 no. 27).²⁹⁰ Other Theophrastean texts that mention proverbs refer to *On Dispositions* 436 no. 1, 529A–B, *Ethics* 436 no. 2a, 529A–B and *On the Ludicrous* 666 no. 23, 710. That Theophrastus made mention of proverbs in still other works is not to be doubted.

3. Unassigned

739 Philodemus, *On Death*, P. Herc. 807, col. 14.10 (CErc vol. 3 [1973] p. 96 Ievoli); REPLACE with the text of Giuliano (CErc vol. 39 [2009] p. 256) printed below.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Hesychius, *Lexicon* s.v. Ἴωνικόν (no. 1200, vol. 2 p. 384 Latte): Ἴωνικόν· τρυφερόν· ἢ ἐπὶ τοῦ κατεαγότος καὶ θηλυκοῦ. ἐπὶ τούτῳ γὰρ ἐκωμωδοῦντο οἱ Ἴωνες, “Ionian: delicate; or with reference to the broken and effeminate. For on account of this the Ionians are lampooned.”

²⁸⁹ For a positive view of living in luxury, see Heraclides of Pontus, fr. 39 Schütrumpf. There a luxurious life is viewed as the cause of the Athenian victory over the Persians. For comment, see E. Schütrumpf, “Heraclides Ponticus on Pleasure” in *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts, Translation and Discussion*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh et al. = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 15 (New Brunswick: Transaction 2009) p. 78, 81–82, 88–89. One might argue that the Athenians who defeated the Persians were indeed pushing the limit in regard to luxury, but they had not crossed over into a debilitating excess. Interesting but speculative and best left aside in this place.

²⁹⁰ The reference to *On Pleasure* is not unambiguous, for Athenaeus twice refers to a work *On Pleasure* whose authorship was in doubt (550.5–6 and 553.2). In addition, Diogenes’ catalogue of Theophrastean writings includes two works *On Pleasure*. One is distinguished by the phrase “like (that of) Aristotle,” and the second by the word “other” (436 no. 26 and 27). For discussion see *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) pp. 207–210.

Literature: Crönert (1906) p. 114 n. 515; Ievoli (1973) p. 96; Giuliano (2009) pp. 256–257, 276–277

Text 739 is from Philodemus' work *On Death*, which was at least four books long.²⁹¹ The text printed in the text-translation volumes, Θ]εόφροστον ἀθετε[ί]ν ταῦτα. πρῶτον μὲν γάρ, is that of Angelina Ievoli. It has been superseded by that of Laura Giuliano, who edited the entire papyrus, which she published together with an introduction, translation and commentary.²⁹² In Giuliano's edition, text 739 is col. 20.12–16. It is twice as long as the text of Ievoli, but both are mere scraps: Ievoli's text runs six words and that of Giuliano twelve. Here is the text according to Giuliano:

Θ]εό-
φραστον ἀθετε[ί]ν ταῦτα·
πρῶτον μὲν γάρ οὐδ' ἐπι-
15 [χ]ειρεῖν ἔδει διὰ τοιούτων
[λόγ]ων
that Theophrastus denied these things.
For first it was necessary
not to argue using such reasons

The first three words of the Greek text constitute a clause, in which the use of the accusative suggests indirect discourse. The pronoun ταῦτα provides an object for ἀθετεῖν, but we are left wondering to what the pronoun refers. The immediately preceding lines of column 20 are woefully lacunose and therefore of no help.²⁹³ What follows is only nine words long. The occurrence of γάρ indicates that an explanation will be given; the occurrence of πρῶτον tells us that the explanation will involve more than one step. But the column becomes lacunose (at the end of line 16 δεχόμενα occurs, after which the text is quite unreadable) so that the explanation is lost. If I understand Giuliano correctly,²⁹⁴ she thinks that the γάρ-clause introduces Filodemus' reason for rejecting Theophrastus' denial: Theophrastus should not have based his argument for denial on such considerations. Most likely that is the correct way to understand 739, but it seems at least possible to understand the γάρ-clause as giving Theophrastus' explanation for his denial of certain

²⁹¹ See Crönert p. 114 n. 515, who cites P.Herc. 1050 (Φιλοδήμου Περὶ θανάτου δ'), and the edition of W.B. Henry, *Philodemus, On Death* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature 2009) p. xv, 94–95.

²⁹² I am grateful to Tiziano Dorandi for calling my attention to the edition of Giuliano.

²⁹³ Ievoli p. 96.

²⁹⁴ Giuliano p. 276.

things: He (whoever argued for the things denied by Theophrastus) should not have argued on the basis of such considerations.²⁹⁵

The occurrence of the verb ἀθετεῖν is apt to make a philologist think of editing texts and athetising words and clauses, whole paragraphs and even entire works (LSJ s.v. II).²⁹⁶ But the verb is compatible with a wide range of objects (LSJ s.v. I.1–3) and its use in a work *On Death* suggests something other than deleting unwanted text. As stated, the immediately preceding text is too lacunose to be helpful, but in an Epicurean work *On Death* it is perhaps reasonable to think of an unqualified assertion like “Death is nothing to us”²⁹⁷ and a full blown materialism that rules out an immortal intellect. Such views would be unacceptable to Theophrastus,²⁹⁸ but it seems quite impossible to demonstrate that these views accurately represent the objects of ἀθετεῖν. Further speculation would be otiose.

740 Philodemus, *Herculaneum Index of Academics*, P. Herc. 1021, col. T.1–6 (*CErc* vol. 15 [1985] p. 92 Gaiser and *CErc* vol. 3 [1973] p. 93 Ievolo)

Literature: Crönert (1903) pp. 385–386, (1906) p. 67; Ievolo (1973) p. 93; Gaiser (1985) p. 86, 92–93, 98–99, (1988) pp. 118–119, 188–189, 453–458; Dorandi (1991) pp. 40–41, 135, 188, 225

Text 740 is the longest of the three unassigned texts. As printed in the text-translation volumes it contains twenty words.²⁹⁹ Below I have drawn

²⁹⁵ As a cautionary note, I call attention to the fact that Philodemus was not uncritically disposed to reject any and every view of Theophrastus. Indeed, he says that his views were not unworthy of consideration (see Chapter II “The Sources” no. 1 p. 9). Moreover, philosophers *qua* human beings are prone to find allies in persons whose views are not entirely in line with their own. Porphyry may be an example. In arguing against eating meat, he cites Theophrastus’ arguments against killing animals, even though the arguments were focused on animal sacrifice. The preceding observations are not intended as an argument for viewing 739 as an example of Philodemus citing Theophrastus to support his own position. But they should remind us that in philosophy as elsewhere opponents often share areas of agreement or pretend to do so.

²⁹⁶ See, e.g., Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Dinarchus* 9 and Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.34, both cited by LSJ.

²⁹⁷ Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus* ap. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 10.124: μηδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἶναι τὸν θάνατον.

²⁹⁸ For Theophrastus’ understanding of intellect, see 271, 483–485 and *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics pp. 393–408.

²⁹⁹ In the text-translation volumes, we printed a combined text based on Ievolo (1973) p. 93 and Gaiser (1985) p. 92. Details are given in the heading to this comment. If and when there is a second edition of FHS&G, I would recommend replacing the printed text with the longer

on newer editions by Konrad Gaiser and Tiziano Dorandi (1988 and 1991, respectively) and extended the selection by four lines so that it runs 34 words (counting the two occurrences of δ'). Here is the extended selection:

γράφει δ' ὑπ[ἐ]ρ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα
 Διόδωρος, δς [ί]στ[ο]ρῶν κατὰ
 Θεόφραστον γέγονεν ἄ-
 πό Σπενσίππου· "φύσιν δὲ
 καὶ φιλοπονίαν ἀξί[α]ν
 ἔσχε μνήμης· [ο]ὐ γὰρ μό-
 νον περὶ τ[ῶ]ν ἐνδεχο-
 [μ]ένων ἐπ[ρ]αγματεύθη[ι]
 [κ]αὶ περὶ πάντων δ' ἰκα-
 [νά] τιν' εἶρη[κ]εν"

About him (Seusippus) Diodorus, who did his research in the time of Theophrastus³⁰⁰ and was a pupil of Speusippus, writes these things. "He had a nature and industriousness worth remembering, for not only did he investigate everything possible and also express himself adequately about all things"

740 comes from the Herculaneum *Index of Academics* and is of special interest in that it well exemplifies the challenges that confront papyrologists. The text was originally written on the backside of P.Herc. 1021 and is preserved today only in the Oxford hand-drawn copy of the papyrus.³⁰¹ Since what is written of the backside of a roll is usually written in the opposite direction to what is written on the front side, one might assume that the backside of 1021 is to be read that way. But that is not the case. The front side of 1021 is an unfinished draft of Philodemus' book *On the Academics*, and what occurs on the backside are additions to what was written on the front.³⁰² These additions were written behind the relevant columns on the front side and were referred to from the front side by the word ὀπίσω,

text that is based on the editions of Gaiser (1988) and Dorandi (1991) and printed below in this comment. I.e., instead of T 1–6, print T 1–10.

³⁰⁰ Ievolo p. 93 translates κατὰ with "secondo" = "according to," which is a common meaning of κατὰ. But if we accept the text as printed by Gaiser and Dorandi (and I think we should), then "in the time of" suits the context better. For the preposition κατὰ used with the accusative case and in a temporal sense, see, e.g., Goodwin's *Greek Grammar* (1879) p. 258 no. 1211.2(b). For an especially clear example, see Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 4.1 128A, printed above, p. 94 Ch III no. 8.

³⁰¹ I. Gallo, "Sulla struttura del. PHerc. 1021," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 13 (1983) pp. 75–79.

³⁰² G. Cavallo, "Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano. Introduzione allo studio dei materiali greci," Supplement 1 to *Cronache ercolanesi* 13 (1983) 61–62, "I rotoli di Ercolano come prodotti scritti. Quattro riflessioni," *Scrittura e Civiltà* 8 (1984) pp. 16–17 and T. Dorandi, *Storia dei filosofi. Platone e l'Academia* (Napoli: Bibliopolis 1991) p. 111.

“behind.”³⁰³ Applied to 740, we can say that the text was intended as an addition to certain lacunose remarks on the front side, which include the following words: [γυ]ναῖκες [συνεσ]χό[λ]α[σα]ν ἐ[ν] ἀνδρείαι [ἐσθῆ]τι, “and women in male clothing attended the school together” (col. 6.25–26). Immediately after [ἐσθῆ]τι, come five letters: ΟΓΥC and *supra lineam* Ω.³⁰⁴ Mekler and Gaiser see in these letters the word ὀπίσω, which functions as a flag indicating that 740 belongs here. Dorandi expresses cautious approval.³⁰⁵

740 begins with the words γράφει δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. Given the lacunose state of the front side of the papyrus, it is not immediately clear to whom αὐτοῦ refers. But in what follows, we are told that Diodorus studied under Speusippus,³⁰⁶ and that exposure would enable him to write about Speusippus, commenting on his nature and industriousness. Moreover, Diogenes Laertius tells us that in his *Memorabilia*, Diodorus mentioned Speusippus as the first to posit a common element in all studies (*Lives* 4.2). Assuming that Philodemus and Diogenes are referring to the same Diodours, then it seems reasonable to suppose that the words γράφει δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ in 740 refer to what Diodorus wrote in his *Memorabilia* or another work, in which he discussed the character of Speusippus.³⁰⁷

The preceding remarks make clear that 740 is an interesting text both from a papyrological standpoint and in regard to Speusippus. The same cannot be said concerning Theophrastus. He is mentioned as a date and nothing more. Indeed, we cannot be absolutely certain that the Theophrastus named in 740 is the Peripatetic philosopher. He just might be one of two eponymous archons named Theophrastus, who were contemporaries of the philosopher.³⁰⁸

³⁰³ Gaiser (1985) pp. 85–86.

³⁰⁴ See the photo in Gaiser (1988) p. 188.

³⁰⁵ Dorandi (1991) p. 225.

³⁰⁶ Speusippus succeeded Plato as head of the Academy in 348/7 BC. He died in 339.

³⁰⁷ Gaiser (1985) pp. 92–93, (1988) pp. 453–458. For persons interested in character, the reference to φύσις and φιλοπονία is apt to arouse interest. φύσις and φιλοπονία can be understood as innate character in general and innate industriousness or hardiness in particular. Alternatively, φύσις and φιλοπονία can be used of second nature acquired through training. On φύσις referring to an acquired disposition, see, e.g., *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) pp. 354–355, 470–471 and “Biography and the Aristotelian Peripatos” in *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin: De Gruyter 2007) pp. 58–60. That said, I want to be clear that 740 is focused on the Academic Speusippus and not on Theophrastus’ understanding of moral character. See Gaiser (1988) p. 454, who glosses φύσις, as used in 740, with “angeborene Begabung,” i.e., with innate talent.

³⁰⁸ In 340–339 BC and again in 313–312 the name of the eponymous archon in Athens was Theophrastus (see above, p. 179 n. 135). If the Theophrastus named in 740 is one of the two

741 Philodemus, *On Love of Reputation* (?), P. Herc. 1025, tab. 14 (*Kolotes und Menedemos* p. 91 n. 447 Crönert)

Literature: Crönert (1906) p. 91 n. 447; Ievoli (1973) p. 96; Tepedino Guerra (1984) p. 574

Text 741 is only three words long: κατὰ τὸν Θεόφραστον. The preposition involves emendation (three letters are supplied), and in the absence of context the meaning of the preposition is not clear. We have translated “according to,” which is in line with another Philodemus text, 689A.3, in which the same phrase occurs. There we have translated “as Theophrastus states,” but the meaning of the Greek phrase is most likely the same. In 689A Philodemus is focused on earlier writers on metaphor: he tells us that they deplore or exalt metaphor and quotes Theophrastus on the apologetic metaphor. The quotation itself is interrupted by the phrase κατὰ τὸν Θεόφραστο[ν]. That creates a minor awkwardness, but it does make clear that the surrounding words are attributable to Theophrastus. In translating the prepositional phrase, we might have written “according to Theophrastus” but we preferred to translate “as Theophrastus states” as a way of calling attention to the fact that Philodemus is quoting and not merely reporting in his own words. Not that κατὰ itself indicates direct quotation. It is quite compatible with offering a report in one’s own words. But given the preceding use of ἐπιφωνοῦντες (689A.2)—Philodemus uses ἐπιφωνεῖν to introduce direct quotation³⁰⁹—it seemed appropriate to translate with “as Theophrastus states.”

Comparing 741 with 689A may be instructive, but a measure of caution is in order. In 689A the context makes clear how the preposition κατὰ is to be understood. The same is not true of 741, so that we must leave open the possibility that κατὰ is being used in another way (see above, the comment on 740). Disappointing perhaps, but we can take a cue from Ievoli and conclude that a scrap of text like 741, when combined with other references

archons, the second strikes me as the more likely candidate. For the use of κατὰ followed by a proper noun in the accusative to indicate the year of an archon, see Philodemus, *Herculaneum Index of Academics* col. Q 4–5 κατὰ Φίλοκ[ρ]άτην (p. 151.5 Dorandi together with the note ad loc. on p. 241). Nevertheless, in a text about a philosopher, the Theophrastus referred to is more likely to be the Peripatetic, who was scholarch from 322 to 286.

³⁰⁹ We are indebted to David Sedley, who called our attention to the verb ἐπιφωνοῦντες at 689A.2. He compared *On Rhetoric* vol. 2 p. 50.3 Sudhaus and explained that Philodemus uses the verb ἐπιφωνεῖν to introduce direct quotation.

to Theophrastus in the Herculaneum papyri, confirms that Theophrastus played a role in the writings of Philodemus, who continued the polemic of Epicurus against the school of Aristotle.³¹⁰

Tepedino Guerra offers an overview of papyrus (PHerc. 1025), in which text 741 occurs. She reports that we are left with 23 lacunose columns, whose paternity is in doubt. Two titles, *Περὶ πλούτου* and *Περὶ φιλοδοξίας*, *On Wealth* and *On Love of Honor*, are mentioned only to be set aside in favor of an unspecified work whose content was ethical. That is sound judgment, since the readable portions of the papyrus frequently exhibit a concern with ethical matters.³¹¹ In line with this emphasis, Tepedino Guerra offers an ethical comment on 741. She notes that the phrase *κατὰ τὸν Θεόφραστον* occurs in column 22 and calls attention to the mention of *ἀγροικία*, “boorishness,” in column 18. She tells us that Theophrastus regarded boorishness as a vice and points out that in the *Characters* it is the subject of Theophrastus’ fourth sketch, in which the disposition is defined as *ἀμαθία ἀσχήμων*, “unseemly ignorance.”³¹² She goes on to take note of Aristotle’s interest in boorishness (*Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7 1108a25–26, 4.8 1128a7–8, b1–3 and *Eudemian Ethics* 2.2 1220b, 3.7 1234a4–10), and for good measure she takes a look at Plutarch’s work *On How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* (14 57C, 25 66C). She concludes that 741 occurred in an ethical context in which there will have been an echo of the Theophrastean *Characters*.³¹³ Tepedino Guerra may well be correct; I note only that as presented the comment is based on a reference to boorishness that occurs four columns earlier than the prepositional phrase that mentions Theophrastus. I leave the matter to the experts on Philodemus.

³¹⁰ Ievoli p. 96. Cf. Tepedino Guerra p. 575.

³¹¹ Tepedino Guerra pp. 569–572.

³¹² Whereas Tepedino Guerra p. 574 expresses herself in a way that makes Theophrastus the author of the definition, I have chosen to express myself in a way that leaves open whether the definition is that of Theophrastus or a later addition to the text. Currently the majority opinion seems to be that the definitions are spurious, being later than Theophrastus and earlier than Philodemus. See *Commentary* 6.1 on ethics (2011) p. 139 with n. 51.

³¹³ *Ibid.* pp. 574–575.

V.

SUMMARY

Chapter Two discusses the sources (727 no. 1–26) for the titles and texts printed under the heading “Miscellaneous Items.” The late Hellenistic Period/the Roman Republic is represented by a single source: namely, Philodemus of Gadara (no. 1), whose work survives on papyrus rolls that were badly damaged by the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD. In the present commentary, three scraps of papyrus (739–741, twelve, twenty and three words long) are discussed briefly.

The High Roman Empire is more fully represented. First comes Pliny the Elder (no. 2), whose voluminous *Natural History* mentions Theophrastus 80 times. Especially relevant for this commentary is the catalogue of inventors and inventions, which occurs in Book 7. It is loosely tied to what precedes and is itself loosely arranged, apparently taken over from existing literature. Theophrastus is mentioned 4 times in three passages (731–733).

Three sources follow, each of which mentions Theophrastus in regard to well-known sayings or proverbs. One of the sources is Plutarch (no. 3), whose wide reading and numerous writings make him a valuable source in regard to Theophrastus. In the text-translation volumes, Plutarchan texts are printed or cited 67 times. In the present commentary, our interest is in a text (624), found in *Greek Questions*, a work whose style invites comparison with the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*. A second source is the grammarian Harpocration (no. 4), whose *Lexicon* refers to Theophrastus 22 times. In the text that interests us (737), Theophrastus’ work *On Proverbs* is mentioned. The third source is the Anonymous commentator on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* (no. 5). He cites Theophrastus 3 times, twice referring to *On Dispositions*, once in combination with the *Ethics* (529A). The Anonymous may be drawing on Adrastus.

Clement of Alexandria (no. 6) was born a pagan and converted to Christianity. His knowledge of Greek literature was extensive, but not always accurate. On one occasion, he seems to misreport Theophrastus’ view of the divinity and on another to be misled by a faulty secondary source. He is, however correct that Theophrastus wrote on discoveries/inventions (728).

Athenaeus of Naucratis (no. 7), who wrote the fifteen volume work *The Sophists at Dinner*, worked in Rome, where he had access to the large library

of his patron Livius Larensius. He may have been able to consult the works of Theophrastus directly but equally he may have satisfied himself with intermediaries. Either way, Athenaeus exhibits a commendable interest in correct attribution.

Diogenes Laertius (no. 8) is unique among our sources in that he wrote a Life of Theophrastus which included a catalogue of the Eresian's writings. The catalogue is of great value: many of the titles listed therein are found in no other source, but the origin of the catalogue is problematic. In the past, it was common to associate the catalogue closely with Hermippus, who wrote a biography of Theophrastus, which will have included a catalogue of his writings. But that now seems too simplistic.

Four sources belong to the Carolingian Renaissance. One is a Greek-Latin Glossary by Martin of Laon (no. 10), in which the *Peplos* of Theophrastus is cited for a report concerning the invention of the Greek alphabet (735). The other three sources are commentaries on Martianus Capella's book *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury*. One is anonymous. An earlier attribution to Dunchad of Rheims (no. 9) is based on a misplaced folio. The second is by John Scotus Eriugena (no. 11) and the third by Remigius of Auxerre (no. 12). All three of the commentaries cite the *Peplos* of Theophrastus for the report that Corax invented the art of words (736A–C). In addition, Eriugena twice explains the name of Theophrastus and seems to err in explaining why Apollo is called the Pythian augur. Remigius offers a weak comment on Martianus' statement that Theophrastus used to apply pipes to mental afflictions. He also tells us that Corax handed over the rules of Theophrastus to the Latins, which is quite improbable. In regard to Theophrastus' view of the Milky Way, he cites Macrobius with considerable accuracy. Whether Macrobius correctly reported the view of Theophrastus is another matter.

Byzantium is represented by two sources. One is Georgius Choeroboscus (no. 13), a grammarian and churchman, whose works survive as lecture notes made by students. As such the works are selective and open to error. The second is Michael of Ephesus (no. 14), who wrote exegetical works on Aristotle. He depends heavily on earlier commentators.

Two anthologies are represented. That of Stobaeus (no. 15) contains excerpts drawn from 500 different authors. The text-translation volumes include 26 passages, either printed or cited, in which Theophrastus is named. Under "Miscellaneous Items," a single passage has been printed in which Theophrastus is cited as part of a report concerning the proverb "Know Yourself" (738). A very different anthology is *Light of the Soul* (no. 16). It is a compilation of *exempla* for use in Christian sermons. In regard to Theophrastus, it must be used with considerable caution.

There are also scholia on poets: Homer, Pindar, Euripides and Apollonius of Rhodes. The origins of the scholia are not simple. Those dealing with Homer's *Iliad* (no. 17) are a clear example. The scholia divide into three groups, A and tB and D. In the case of A, we can say that the group is fully and well represented by a tenth century codex, in which the scholia are written in the margin by a single hand. A subscription at the end of most books tells us that the scholia derive from four different works dating from the first century BC to the second century AD. Material from those works was combined along with other material in a commentary dating to the fourth century. That commentary was the source or rather the source's source for the scholia on the *Iliad*. In regard to Pindar (no. 18), the scholia divide into those that focus on meter and those that are exegetical. Both have their origins in the Hellenistic period. The exegetical scholia were abbreviated in second century AD and are largely free of additions. Similarly the scholia on Euripides (no. 19) have their roots in Hellenistic commentaries that became the basis of a composite commentary toward the end of the first century BC. Apollonius of Rhodes (no. 20) lived and wrote at the beginning of the Hellenistic period. His work was commented on already in the first century BC and continued to be the subject of commentaries during the early principate. The scholia that have come down to us are said to derive from these early commentaries

Six Arabic sources from the end of the tenth century to the middle of thirteenth conclude the discussion of sources. They are the Baghdad bookseller, scribe, and bibliographer Ibn-an-Nadīm (no. 21), the Nestorian theologian and churchman, Baghdad hospital physician, and philosopher Abū-l-Farağ Ibn-aṭ-Ṭayyib (no. 22), the outstanding scientist of medieval Islam Al-Birūnī (no. 23), the Egyptian/Syrian scholar and administrator in Aleppo Ibn-al-Qiftī (no. 24), the abridger of Ibn-al-Qiftī's biographical work *az-Zawzanī* (no. 25) and the Syrian physician and bibliographer Ibn-Abī-Uṣaybi'a (no. 26).

Chapter Three is concerned with the titles of Theophrastus' writings. Our primary source is Diogenes Laertius' *Life of Theophrastus*, which contains a catalogue of the philosopher's writings. Some 244 titles are recorded, which divide into five distinct lists plus an addendum of two titles. Four of the five lists are organized alphabetically.

In a commentary on "Miscellaneous Items," a list of titles announcing unrelated writings is to be expected. List 727 is no exception. At the head of the list stands *Lectures* and at the end comes *Letters*. Nevertheless, the list divides into recognizable groups and to that extent exhibits a measure

of coherence. Titles no. 1 and 2 are a *Course of Lectures* and *Afternoon (Discussions)*. Both relate to teaching within the Peripatos, but *pace* Usener, the titles do not refer to one and the same work. No. 1 most likely contained material used in presenting a series of lectures. It is possible but not provable that no. 2 contained material used in teaching rhetoric to a wider audience during the afternoon.

Next comes a series of titles, no. 3–7, referring to collective works, which will have brought together material used in teaching and/or assembled for study outside the classroom. The first three belong to the genre of problem-literature: no. 3 *Collection of Problems*, no. 4 *Political, Natural, Erotic, Ethical Problems* and no. 5 *On the Problems concerning Nature*. All three invite comparison with the pseudo-Aristotelian *Physical Problems*, i.e., *Problems Concerning Nature*, in which questions are posed and then answered in a formulaic manner. In the pseudo-Aristotelian work, the focus is almost exclusively on physiology (Book 29 is an exception). The mention of political, erotic and ethical problems in title no. 4 suggests a wider range of topics, but it is not impossible and even likely that Theophrastus took note of the way in which physiology affects human behavior. There follow two titles: no. 6 *Aristotelian or Theophrastean Memoranda* and no. 7 *Research Memoranda*, both of which are likely to have been collections of notes of varying length. No. 6 is an example of uncertain authorship: either Aristotle or Theophrastus. Indeed, it is uncertain whether the notes were made by Aristotle or Theophrastus themselves or by someone else, perhaps a student, who made notes during lecture or while reading writings available within the Peripatos. Be that as it may, the work was six books in length, so that the content is likely to have been wide ranging, i.e., not limited to the subjects touched upon in the two texts that refer to the work by title (587 and 373). Title no. 7 is found only in a scholium on Apollonius of Rhodius. Theophrastus' work is cited in regard to information concerning meteorological matters off the coast of Italy (196A). The length of the work cannot be determined nor can the range of material contained therein.

Title no. 8, *On Research*, occurs only in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. It has been listed after *Research Memoranda* largely on the basis of a shared reference to research. It is possible that the work focused on the writing of history, i.e., recording political and military affairs. Alternatively, the title may announce a general discussion of research, i.e., a discussion of the methods and principles of investigation that find application in a variety of different areas, coupled with a clear recognition that the various areas of research are not alike in all details, so that sound investigation is necessarily subject specific.

Title no. 9 *Book of Commentaries* or simply *Commentary* might refer to one or more commentaries by Theophrastus on existing writings by other people including Aristotle. If so, a wide range of writings on a variety of topics is likely to have been discussed: e.g. logic (285), material elements (181) and psychic capacities (289). But that is speculation based on a late source that is notoriously unreliable: namely, *Light of the Soul*, which contains illustrative material for Christian preachers. Another title based on a late source or rather sources is Title no. 10, *Peplos* or *Robe*. It is found in four writers of the Carolingian Renaissance, who cite Theophrastus' *Robe* for reports concerning the discovery of the alphabet (735), the invention of the art of rhetoric (736A–C), and a report concerning Apollo qua Pythian prophet (582). The title *Peplos* recalls the elaborately embroidered robe that was presented yearly to Athena, and in the Roman period *Peplos* was recognized as a suitable title for works whose subject matter is miscellaneous. The title is unlikely to be Theophrastean in origin. It could refer to a genuine work of Theophrastus that was known originally by a different title, but it is also possible that the title refers to a compilation that post-dates Theophrastus.

Title no. 11 *On Discoveries* translates Περί εὐρημάτων. Depending on context, the title might be translated *On Inventions*. Whether Aristotle wrote a work carrying the same title is problematic. His pupil Heraclides of Pontus, who became a member of the Academy, did write such a work. Theophrastus successor as head of the School, Strato of Lampsacus wrote on discoveries, but the title and the focus of the work is uncertain. Theophrastus' work most likely collected traditional reports involving mythology and local lore. But with only three texts that refer explicitly to *On Discoveries*, certainty concerning the content is not possible. A different title sharing the same root is Περί εὐρέσεως, *On Invention* (666 no. 4). It could be an alternate title for Περί εὐρημάτων, but most likely it refers to a rhetorical work that dealt with finding and formulating arguments that would be persuasive and appealing to a given audience.

Title no. 12 *On the Wise Men* is attributed to Theophrastus only in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. It is likely to have taken account of the Seven Sages and the sayings to which their names were attached. In addition, it is at least possible that the work played a role in the alleged controversy between Theophrastus and Dicaearchus: the former championing the philosophic life of contemplation and the latter the active life of civic involvement. Title no. 13 *Acicharus* refers to a wise man: not one of the Greek Sages but to an Aramean who was an advisor to the king of Syria and known for wise sayings. He adopted his nephew as his son, instructed him in wisdom, but was betrayed, escaped being put to death and ultimately

secured revenge. No Greek version of the story survives, but it is clear that the story influenced the assimilation of Acicharus to Aesop, perhaps as early as the fifth century. Title no. 14 *On Proverbs* is found in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. The title is found also in Stobaeus and Harpocration, but the information conveyed is minimal. We can only say that in one case Theophrastus spoke of a proverb and in another of a saying attributed to Bias (738 and 737, respectively). A work carrying the title *On Proverbs* is attributed to Clearchus by Athenaeus. Source texts for the latter indicate that the work was not a mere collection of sayings: comments of various kinds were included.

Title no. 15 *Letters* and Title no. 16a *Letters to Astycreon, Phantias, Nicanor* are found in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings. Since no. 15 is said to have been three books long and no. 16a lists three addressees, it is tempting to identify the two. The possibility cannot be ruled out, but it should be noted that the three addressees named in 16a are not the only persons to whom Theophrastus wrote. Correspondence with Eudemus of Rhodes is attested and there will have been others, all or some of whom may have been addressees of letters that were collected in the three books entitled *Letters*. In the text-translation volumes no. 16b *Letter to Phantias* has been printed as a title. That now seems to have been a mistake. 16b refers to a single letter written to Phantias and is not to be construed as a title. The few sources that give some indication of what Theophrastus wrote to a particular correspondent, e.g., Phantias, must be used judiciously.

Chapter Four discusses source-texts. It divides into three sections, of which the first deals with discoveries and beginnings. Theophrastus wrote a work on the subject, *On Discoveries* (see above), in which he concerned himself with the question, "Who discovered/invented what?" Theophrastus also took account of "firsts" in works whose primary interest was other than discoveries. An example is *On Piety*, in which discoveries and inventions play a role within a developmental account religious practices.

Aside from Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean writings, there are three texts that refer to *On Discoveries* by title. One is 728, which is found in Clement of Alexandria's *Patchwork*. Theophrastus is named as one of eight authors, on whom Clement drew when recording the discoveries and inventions of non-Greeks. For the invention of stone-cutting and alloying bronze, Theophrastus may well have been Clement's source. We might add geometry, but that is no more than a possibility. The text reflects the general understanding among Greeks that their civilization is later than and owes much to that of non-Greeks.

Text 528 has been referred to within the section on “Discoveries and Beginnings” despite the fact that it does not focus on some human being *qua* innovator. Rather, it tells us that the god Apollo first began to prophesy after he had killed the serpent on the island of Delos. That goes against long standing tradition. The attribution of the story to Theophrastus needs explanation.

Text 729, which does not refer to *On Discoveries*, is taken from a scholium on Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica* 1248–1250, where the poet speaks of Prometheus as bound and having his liver eaten by an eagle. The scholiast reports the interpretations of four authorities including Theophrastus, who said that Prometheus was first to give men a share in philosophy, and for this reason the story was handed down that he gave them a share in fire. Theophrastus words involve metaphor. Both philosophy and fire are illuminating: the one clarifies thinking and the other makes it possible to see clearly. Hence, in giving men philosophy, Prometheus gave them a share in fire. What the scholiast reports may go back to *On Discoveries*, but that cannot be demonstrated.

Text 730 is the second text to make explicit reference to *On Discoveries*. It is a scholium on Homer’s *Iliad* 1.449, where the poet speaks of sacrifice and the scattering of barley-groats. According to the scholiast, Theophrastus said that before men learned to grind barley grains, men ate them intact, so that Homer calls them whole. The explanation of Homeric usage is faulty: οὐλαί and οἶλος are not cognate words. At issue is whether Theophrastus has erred or the explanation is an unfortunate addition attributable to the scholiast or his source.

Texts 731–733, none of which refers to *On Discoveries*, are all taken from Pliny’s *Natural History*, Book 7. Text 732 comes first and mentions Theophrastus twice: in regard to the invention of stone-quarries and in regard to towers. In the latter case, there is apparent disagreement between Theophrastus and Aristotle, but the disagreement can be mitigated or even eliminated: one focused on the place and the other on the builders. Text 731 concerns the alloying of bronze. Again there is apparent disagreement between the two Peripatetics, but they may be reporting separate traditions and not their own considered opinions. Text 733 concerns *inter alia* the origins of painting in Greece. For a third time Aristotle and Theophrastus appear to be at odds, and again the disagreement can be mitigated. Pliny cites Theophrastus when he says that painting was originated in Greece by the Athenian Polygnotus. At first reading, that not only creates opposition with Aristotle, who is said to have named Euchir, but also absurd to such a degree that the reference to Theophrastus cannot be taken seriously. Nevertheless, if we ask

what may underlie and have given rise to Pliny's words, an answer is possible. Polygnotus is called an Athenian because the Athenians made him a citizen for his artistic contributions to the city, and he was recognized as an innovator because he introduced new techniques that transformed the painting of his day.

Text 734 is the third text to mention by title the work *On Discoveries*. The text is a scholium on Pindar's *Olympian Ode* 13, in which we are told that Theophrastus recognized a Corinthian named Hyperbius as the inventor of the potter's wheel. It is not clear whether the basic potter's wheel is being attributed or the kick-wheel. Given that the basic wheel was in use before 2,200 BC, we might prefer the kick-wheel and see it as an improvement that was considered an invention. Nevertheless, we should keep in mind that Hyperbius is a murky figure. Theophrastus may have thought of him as a creation of Corinthian lore, and on that basis mentioned him in *On Discoveries*.

Text 735 is taken from a ninth century Greek-Latin glossary. It begins by announcing a source, Theophrastus' *Peplos* or *Robe*, and by explaining the name of Theophrastus. What follows concerns the origin of the alphabet. The Egyptians are said to have been the first to invent letters (used inclusively to cover hieroglyphics). Second were the Phoenicians, after whom letters are called Phoenician. Cadmus brought 16 letters to Greece, after which Palamedes added four and Simonides another four for a total of 24. The account is based on received tradition (*sic accepimus*) and differs in details from other accounts, in which Palamedes is replaced by Epicharmus and the number of letters, original and added, is different.

Texts 736A–C are all taken from Carolingian commentators on the *Marriage of Philology and Neptune* by Martianus Capella. All are concerned with the opening of Book 5, in which an imposing woman is presented who will identify herself as Rhetoric. She is carrying a rod of precedence atop of which is perched a crow, *corax*. There is word play here: Corax, a fifth century Sicilian, is the putative founder of rhetoric. The three commentators get that right: they cite the *Robe* of Theophrastus and state that Corax invented the art of words. Nevertheless, one commentator, Remigius, muddies the water by identifying Corax with a Roman orator who belonged to the race of Corvinus.

Text 718 (new reference) tells us that Theophrastus considered Andron of Catania in Sicily to have been the first aulos-player to make rhythmical movements with his body while playing. This Andron is mentioned nowhere else. His date is uncertain, though early fifth century has been suggested. Interesting is the statement that Andron's movements resulted in dancing

being called “sikelizing” by the ancients. The statement may have occurred in *On Discoveries*, but other Theophrastean works are also candidates.

The second section of Chapter 4 concerns proverbs. Like Aristotle before him, Theophrastus wrote a work on the topic, as did Clearchus. In his writings on cultural history, Dicaearchus exhibited an interest in proverbs, and in Stobaeus’ *Anthology* we find preserved Demetrius of Phalerum’s collection of the sayings of the Seven Sages. In regard to Theophrastus, we can say that Diogenes’ catalogue of writings lists *On Proverbs*, and two other texts mention the title. One is 737, whose focus is the saying “Rule reveals the man.” i.e., it brings out his real character. Aristotle and Theophrastus are both cited for the attribution to Bias, Sophocles for the attribution to Solon, and Demosthenes for his use of the saying. Attributing the saying to both Bias and Solon is a reflection of the fact that well-formulated sayings are movable. The second text to mention the title is 738, in which “Know yourself” is the focus. Theophrastus, we are told, understands the phrase to be a proverb. Most people, however, think it an apophthegm, ἀπόφθεγμα, of Chilo, while Clearchus thinks that it was said by the god to Chilo. Some scholars have argued that text 738 in combination with 737 makes clear that Theophrastus made an advance over Aristotle by distinguishing between a proverb, παροιμία, and an ἀπόφθεγμα. The idea is to be resisted. More likely Theophrastus used ἀπόφθεγμα as a general word for sayings including proverbs.

Text 529A is from the Anonymous commentator on Aristotle’s *Ethics*. We are told that in the work *On Dispositions* Theophrastus refers to a line of Theognis, “In justice every virtue is brought together,” as a proverb, and in his *Ethics* he says that Phocylides made mention of it. Given that proverbs in general are practical, it is hardly surprising that they played a role in more than one of Theophrastus’ ethical works. 529B depends upon 529A and may be thought to exhibit mindless copying.

Text 549 is taken from Athenaeus, who refers to Theophrastus’ work *On Pleasure*. In speaking of the luxury of the Ionians, Theophrastus seems to have used the proverb “Ionic luxury.”

Three texts name Theophrastus without referring to a specific work. Text 738.5 is a scholium on Euripides’ *Hippolytus*. It tells us that Theophrastus understood “Nothing in excess” and “Do not judge a lawsuit (until you have heard both sides)” as (examples?) of things said by Sisyphus and Pittheus. Text 710 is taken from Athenaeus. It concerns the proverb “No bad/rotten fish is large” which is reported to have been used (not originated) by Stratonichus as a kind of riddle in order to mock two different individuals. Text 624 is from Plutarch’s *Greek Questions*, in which the author asks, “What is the

source of the proverbial saying "This is valid." The answer takes the form of a brief story, in which the Tarentine general Deinon raised his right hand and said "This is stronger," thereby indicating that might makes right. Theophrastus is cited for the story.

The third section of Chapter 4 contains the "Unassigned," three scraps of Herculaneum papyri that have found no home elsewhere in the text-translation volumes. All three are quite short. 739 is from Philodemus' work *On Death* and concerns a denial by Theophrastus: perhaps a denial of Epicurean materialism and the related idea that death is nothing to us. 740 is from the *Index of Academics*. Most likely the text is recording Diodorus' characterization of his teacher Speusippus. Theophrastus is mentioned only as a chronological marker. 741 is from an unspecified work of ethical orientation. Perhaps Theophrastus was quoted or cited for a report. Certainty being impossible, we might satisfy ourselves by seeing in the reference to Theophrastus one more piece of evidence that the Eresian played a role in the writings of Philodemus.

VI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Althoff, J. and Zeller, D. "Antike Textzeugnisse und Überlieferungsgeschichte" in *Die Worte der Sieben Weisen*, ed. Althoff-Zeller = Texte zur Forschung vol. 89 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2006) pp. 5–81.
- Amigues, S. *Théophraste*, Recherches sur les Plantes. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1988–2006.
- Anderson, W. "Musical Developments in the School of Aristotle," *Royal Musical Association Chronicle* 16 (1980) pp. 79–98.
- Arndt, E. *De ridiculi doctrina rhetorica*. Diss. Bonn. Kirchain: 1904.
- Asmis, E. "Philodemus' Epicureanism," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36.4 (1990) pp. 2369–2406.
- Badino, R. *Filostefano di Cirene: Testimonianze e frammenti*. Milano: Edizioni Universitarie 2010.
- Beagon (1992) = Beagon, M. *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1992.
- Beagon (2005) = Beagon, M. *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History, Book 7*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 2005.
- Bignone, E. *L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione di Epicuro* = Il Pensiero Classico 4. Firenze: La Nuova Italia 1936.
- Bollansée (1999a) = Bollansée, J. "Hermippos of Smyrna" in *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IV A 3, 1026. Leiden: Brill 1999.
- Bollansée (1999b) = Bollansée, J. *Hermippos of Smyrna and His Biographical Writings: A Reappraisal*. Leuven: Peeters 1999.
- Boulogne, J. *Plutarque, Oeuvres morales*, vol. 4. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2002.
- Braund, D. and Wilkins, J., ed. *Athenaeus and His World*. Exeter: University Press 2000.
- Brink, K. "Peripatos" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* Suppl. 7 (1940) col. 899–949.
- Brunt, P. "Cicero and Historiography" in *ΦΙΛΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΣ: Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni* (Rome 1980) vol. 1 pp. 311–340; repr. in *Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. J. Marincola (Oxford: University Press 2011) pp. 207–240.
- Carey, S. *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture: Art and Empire in the Natural History*. Oxford: University Press 2003.
- Cavallo, G. "I rotoli di Ercolano come prodotti scritti. Quattro riflessioni," *Scrittura e Civiltà* 8 (1984) pp. 12–17.
- Clark, G. *Porphry, On Abstinence from Killing Animals*. London: Duckworth 2000.
- Crönert (1903) = Crönert, W. "Die Überlieferung des Index Academicorum," *Hermes* 38 (1903) pp. 357–405.
- Crönert (1906) = Crönert, W. *Kolotes und Menedemos*. Leipzig 1906, repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965.

- Daiber, H. "A Survey of Theophrastean Texts and Ideas in Arabic: Some New Material," in *Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh, P. Huby and A. Long = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 2 (1985) pp. 103–114.
- Daniel, R. "Epicharmus in Trier: A Note on the Monnus Mosaic," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 114 (1996) pp. 30–36.
- De Marco, V. "Frammenti di Teopompo, Teofrasto, Callimaco," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* vol. 77 (1984) pp. 195–201.
- Dickey, E. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford: University Press 2007.
- Dindorf, W. *Harpocrationis Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*. Oxford: Typographum Academicum 1853.
- Dorandi (1991) = Dorandi, T. *Storia dei filosofi. Platone e l'Accademia* (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Napoli 1991.
- Dorandi (2006) = Dorandi, T. "Il Περί παροιμιῶν di Clearco di Soli: contributi a una raccolta dei frammenti," *Eikasmos* 17 (2006) pp. 157–170.
- Dorandi (2011) = Dorandi, T. "Prolegomeni a una nuova raccolta dei frammenti di Clearco di Soli," *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 14 (2011) pp. 1–15.
- Drachmann, A. *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*. Leipzig: Teubner 1903–1927, repr. 1966–1969 Amsterdam.
- Düring, I. *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*. Goteborg: Elanders 1957.
- Engels (1993) = Engels, J. "Die Ὑπομνήματα-Schriften und die Anfänge der politischen Biographie und Autobiographie in der griechischen Literatur," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 96 (1993) pp. 19–36.
- Engels (1998) = Engels, J. "Phainias of Eresos" in *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* vol. IV A Biography fasc. 1, ed. G. Schepens (Leiden: Brill 1998) pp. 266–351.
- Ferguson, J. *Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, Books One to Three*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press 1991.
- Fortenbaugh (1975) = Fortenbaugh, W. *Aristotle on Emotion*. London: Duckworth 1975.
- Fortenbaugh (1985) = Fortenbaugh, W. "Theophrastus on Delivery" in *Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Works*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh, P. Huby and A. Long = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 2 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 1985) pp. 269–288.
- Fortenbaugh (2003) = Fortenbaugh, W. "Theophrastus: Piety, Justice and Animals" in *Theophrastean Studies* = Philosophie der Antike 17 (Stuttgart: Steiner 2003) pp. 173–192.
- Fortenbaugh (2005) = Fortenbaugh, W. *Theophrastus of Eresus, Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence, Commentary Volume 8: Sources on Rhetoric and Poetics*. Leiden: Brill 2005.
- Fortenbaugh (2011) = Fortenbaugh, W. *Theophrastus of Eresus, Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence, Commentary Volume 6.1: Sources on Ethics*. Leiden: Brill 2011.
- Fortenbaugh (2012a) = Fortenbaugh, W. "Apollonius on Theophrastus on Aristoxenus" in *Aristoxenus of Tarentum: Discussion*, ed. C. Huffman = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 17 (2012) pp. 155–176.

- Fortenbaugh (2012b) = Fortenbaugh, W. "Aristo of Ceus: The Fragments Concerning Eros," in *Islamic Philosophy, Science, Culture and Religion*, ed. F. Opwis and D. Reisman (Leiden: Brill 2012) pp. 11–23.
- Fortenbaugh (2013) = Fortenbaugh, W. "Cicero's Letter to Atticus 2.16: 'A Great Controversy,'" *Classical World* 106: 515–519.
- Fortenbaugh (2015) = Fortenbaugh, W. "Two Eresians: Phainias and Theophrastus" in *Phainias of Eresus: Texts, Translation and Commentary*, ed. Oliver Hellmann = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 19 (2015) ch. 2.
- Fowler, R.L. "Herodotus and His Contemporaries," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116 (1996) pp. 62–87.
- Fraser, P. & Matthews, E. A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Oxford: University Press 1987–2005.
- Gaiser (1985) = Gaiser, K. "Zur Struktur des Papyrus Herculanensis 1021 (Philodems Buch über die Akademie)" *Cronache Ercolanesi* 15 (1985) pp. 85–99.
- Gaiser (1987) = Gaiser, K. *Philodems Akademica. Die Berichte über Platon und die alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1987.
- Gigon, O. "Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles-Viten," *Museum Helveticum* 15 (1958) pp. 147–193.
- Gildersleeve, B. *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York: 1890, repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965.
- Gilula, D. "Stratonicus, The Witty Harpist," in *Athenaeus and his World*, ed. D. Braud and J. Wilkins (Exeter: Exeter University 2000) pp. 423–433, 584–586.
- Giuliano, L. "PHerc. 807 [Filodemo, *De morte*, libro incerto]," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 39 (2009) pp. 207–280.
- Gudeman, A. "Scholien" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, zweite Reihenfolge 2.1 (1923) col. 625–705.
- Hanslik, R. "Pittheus," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 20 (1950) col. 1873–1875.
- Heylbut, G. "Zu Theophrast," *Rheinisches Museum* 39 (1884) pp. 157–159.
- Hoesch, N. "Polygnotus" in *Brill's New Pauly: Antiquity* vol. 2 (2007) col. 523–525.
- Ievoli, A. "Testimonianze biografiche e motivi dossografici di Teofrasto nei papiri Ercolanesi," *Cronache ercolanesi* 3 (1973) pp. 93–96.
- Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden: Brill 1923–1958.
- Janko, R. *Aristotle on Comedy: Towards a Reconstruction of Poetics II*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California 1984.
- Jax, A. and K. Thraede, "Erfinder I" in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962) col. 1179–1191.
- Jeauneau (1978) = Jeauneau, É. "Le commentaire Érigène sur Martianus Capella (*De nuptiis*, Lib. I) d'après le manuscrit d'Oxford (Bodl. Libr. Auct. T. 2.19 fol. 1–31)" in *Quatre thèmes Érigènes* (Paris: Vrin 1978) pp. 91–166.
- Jeauneau (1979) = Jeauneau, É. "Jean Scot Érigène et le grec" in *Archivum latinitatis mediæ ævi* 41 (1979) pp. 5–50.
- Kaldellis, A. "Skamon of Mytilene" in *Brill's New Jacoby: Brill Online* (2012) no. 476.
- Kennedy (1957) = Kennedy, G. "Theophrastus and Stylistic Distinctions," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 62 (1957) pp. 93–104.
- Kennedy (1963) = Kennedy, G. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: University Press 1963.
- Kindstrand, J. "The Greek Concept of Proverbs." *Eranos* 76 (1978) pp. 71–85.

- Kleingüthner, A. *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* = Philologus Supplementband 26.1. Leipzig: Dieterich 1933.
- Koch, N. *Techne und Erfindung in der klassischen Malerei: Eine terminologische Untersuchung*. München: Biering & Brinkmann 2000.
- Kraus, W. "Prometheus" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 23.1 (1957) col. 653–702.
- Kurke, L. *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose*. Princeton: University Press 2011.
- Labowsky, L. "A New Version of Scotus Eriugena's Commentary on Martianus Capella," *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941–1943) pp. 187–193.
- Laqueur, R. "Phainias" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 19 (1938) col. 1565–1591.
- Lichtenberg, V. "Pittheus" in *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig: Teubner 1902–1909) vol. 3.2 col. 2514–2515.
- Lindenberger (1983) = Lindenberger, J. *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins 1983.
- Lindenberger (1985) = Lindenberger, J. "Ahiqar" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, ed. J. Charlesworth (Garden City NY 1985) pp. 479–507.
- Lippold, G. "Polygnotos 1" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 21 (1952) col. 1630–1639.
- Lucas, D. *Aristotle's Poetics*. Oxford: Clarendon 1968.
- Lutz (1939) = Lutz, C. *Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum*. Cambridge MA: The Medieval Academy of America 1939.
- Lutz (1944) = Lutz, C. *Glossae in Martianum*. Lancaster PA: American Philological Association 1944.
- Maltomini, F. "Sulla trasmissione dei 'Detti dei Sette Sapienti,'" in *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, ed. M. Funghi (Firenze: Olschki 2004) pp. 1–24.
- Manitius, M. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Bd. 1 von Justinian bis zur Mitte des zehnten Jahrhunderts. München: Beck 1911.
- Marincola, J. "Beyond Pity and Fear: The Emotions of History," *Ancient Society* 33 (2003) pp. 285–315.
- Mejer, J. "Eudemus and the History of Science" in *Eudemus of Rhodes*, ed. István Bodnár and William Fortenbaugh = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 11 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2002) pp. 243–261.
- Miller, M. *Glossaire grec-latin de la Bibliothèque de Laon* = Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, vol. 29.2 Paris 1880.
- Mirhady, D. *The Political Thought of Theophrastus: A Critical Edition of the Named Texts with Translation and Commentary*. Diss. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University 1992.
- Mittelhaus, K. *De Plutarchi praeceptis gerendae reipublicae*. Diss. Berlin 1911.
- Morau, P. *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote*. Louvain: Éditions Universitaires 1951.
- Müller, C. *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, Paris: Didot 1851.
- O'Meara, J. *Eriugena*. Oxford: Clarendon 1988.
- Pape, W. and Bensler, G., *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*. Braunschweig: Vieweg 1911.
- Pötscher, W. *Strukturprobleme der aristotelischen und theophrastischen Gottesvorstellung*. Leiden: Brill 1970.
- Préaux, J. "Le commentaire de Martin de Laon sur l'oeuvre de Martianus Capella," *Latomus* 12 (1953) pp. 437–459.

- Rabbie, E. *Cicero über den Witz*. Diss. Amsterdam 1986.
- Rabe, H. *Prolegomenon sylloge* = RhGr vol. 14, Leipzig: Teubner 1931.
- Race, W. *Pindar* vol. 1 = Loeb Classical Library vol. 56: Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press 1977.
- Rebenich, S. "Historical Prose" in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period* 330 B.C.–A.D. 400 (Leiden: Brill 1997) pp. 265–337.
- Regenbogen, O. "Theophrastos 3," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, Supplementband 7 (Stuttgart: Druckenmüller 1940) col. 1354–1562.
- Rieth, A. *Die Entwicklung der Töpferscheibe*. Leipzig: Kabitzsch 1939.
- Robert, C. "Euclair 1" in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 6 (1909) col. 880–881.
- Rose (1854) = Rose, V. *De Aristotelis librorum ordine et auctoritate*, Diss. Berlin: Reimer 1854.
- Rose (1863) = Rose, V. *Aristoteles pseudigraphus*. Leipzig: Teubner 1863.
- Schilling, R. *Plin l'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre VII*: Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2003.
- Schmidt, M. *Commentatio de Theophrasto rhetore*, Diss. Halle 1839.
- Schmitt (1971a) = Schmitt, Ch. "Theophrastus" in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, vol. 2 ed. P. Kristeller and F.E. Cranz (Washington DC: The Catholic Univesity 1971) pp. 239–322.
- Schmitt (1971b) = Schmitt, Ch. "Theophrastus in the Middle Ages," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1971) pp. 251–270.
- Schwartz, J. *Pseudo-Hesiodica: Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'oeuvres attribuées à Hésiode*, Leiden: Brill 1960.
- Schweighäuser, I. *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, 8 vols. Strassburg 1801–1805.
- Sharples (1995) = Sharples, R. *Commentary Volume 5: Sources on Biology*. Leiden: Brill 1995.
- Sharples (1998) = Sharples, R. *Commentary Volume 3.1: Sources on Physics*. Leiden: Brill 1998.
- Sharples (2005) = Sharples, R. "Theophrastus, *On Discoveries* (Texts 728–736 FHS&G)," in *Biodiversity and Natural Heritage in the Aegean*, ed. A. Karamanos and C. Thanos (Athens 2005) pp. 49–67.
- Sheldon-Williams, I. "Eriugena's Greek Sources," in *The Mind of Eriugena, Papers of a Colloquium, Dublin, 14–18 July 1970*, ed. J. O'Meara and L. Bieler (Dublin: Irish University 1973) pp. 1–15.
- Sollenberger, M. *Diogenes Laertius' Life of Theophrastus: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text with a Translation and Commentary*, Diss. New Brunswick: Rutgers University 1984.
- Spengel, L. *Συναγωγή τεχνῶν sive Artium scriptores*. Stuttgart: Cotta 1828.
- Squillace, G. *Menecrate di Siracusa: Un medico del IV secolo a.C. tra Sicilia, Grecia e Macedonia* = Spudasmata 141. Hildesheim: Zürich and New York 2012.
- Stern, S. "Abū 'Isā Ibn al-Munajjim's Chronography" in *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition, Essays Presented by His Friends and Pupils to Richard Walzer*, ed. S. Stern, A. Hourani and V. Brown (Columbia SC: University of South Carolina 1972) pp. 437–466.
- Strömberg, R. "Greek Proverbs," *Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps-och Vitterhets-Samälles Handlingar*, ser. A vol. 4 no. 8 (1954).

- Tepidino Guerra, A., "Il PHerc. 1025," *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Napoli 1984) pp. 569–575.
- Thraede, K. "Erfinder II" in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962) col. 1191–1279.
- Tosi, R. "La lessicografia e la paremiografia" in *La philologie grecque*, ed. N. Richardson et al. (Genève: Vandoeuvres 1994) pp. 143–197.
- Usener (1858) = Usener, H. *Analecta Theophrastea*, Diss. Bonn (Leipzig: Teubner 1858), reprinted in *Kleine Schriften von Herman Usener*, ed. L. Radermacher (Leipzig: Teubner 1912–1913) vol. 1 pp. 50–90.
- Usener (1870): see Usener (1912).
- Usener (1873) = Usener, H. "Vergessenes," *Rheinisches Museum* 28 (1873) pp. 391–435, reprinted in *Kleine Schriften von Hermann Usener*, ed. L. Radermacher (Leipzig: Teubner 1912–1913) vol. 3 pp. 9–55.
- Usener (1878) = Usener, H. "Grammatische Bemerkungen," *Jahrbuch für klassische Philologie* 117 (1878) pp. 51–80; reprinted in *Kleine Schriften von Herman Usener*, ed. L. Radermacher (Leipzig: Teubner 1912–1913) vol. 1 pp. 220–261.
- Usener (1884) = Usener, H., "Zu Theophrast," *Rheinisches Museum* 39 (1884) pp. 157–158.
- Usener (1912) = Usener, H. "Lectiones Graecae," in *Kleine Schriften von Herman Usener*, ed. L. Radermacher (Leipzig: Teubner 1912–1913) vol. 1 pp. 156–203; originally published in *Rheinisches Museum* 25 (1870) pp. 574–616; the reprint contains additional material relevant to the present commentary.
- Walbank, F. "History and Tragedy," *Historia* 9 (1960) 216–234; repr. in *Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. J. Marincola (Oxford: University Press 2011) pp. 389–412.
- Wehrli (1967–1978) = Wehrli, F. *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentare*. vol. 1–10. Basel: Schwabe 1967–1978.
- Wehrli (1983) = Wehrli, F. "Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit," in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. ed. H. Flashar (Basel: Schwabe 1983) pp. 459–499.
- Wehrli, F. and Wöhrle, G. "Theophrast" in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie: Die Philosophie der Antike* Bd. 3, Kap. 3 "Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit," ed. H. Flashar (Basel: Schwabe 2004) pp. 506–557.
- Weinreich, O. *Menekrates Zeus und Salomoneus* = Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 18. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1933.
- Wendling, A. *De Peplo Aristotelico*, Diss. Strasbourg 1891.
- Wilsdorf, H. "Der weise Achikaros bei Demokrit und Theophrast," *Philologus* 135 (1991) pp. 191–206.
- Zhmud (2001) = Zhmud, L. "ΠΠΩΤΟΙ ΕΥΡΕΤΑΙ—Götter, Heroen, Menschen?" *Antike Naturwissenschaften und ihre Rezeption* 11 (2001) 9–21.
- Zhmud (2002) = Zhmud, L. "Eudemus' History of Mathematics" in *Eudemus of Rhodes*, ed. István Bodnár and William Fortenbaugh = Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities vol. 11 (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction 2002) pp. 263–306.
- Zhmud (2006) = Zhmud, L. *The Origin of the History of Science in Classical Antiquity*. Berlin: De Gruyter 2006.
- Ziegler, K. "Plutarchos von Chaironeia"² in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 21 (1951) col. 1–334.

VII.

INDICES TO THE TITLES AND TEXTS

1. *Important Words*

Greek

- ἀγαθός] good, (in military matters) 624.2
 ἄγαν] in excess (nothing) 738.5.1, 4, 6
 ἀθετεῖν] to set aside; to deny 739.1
 αἰνίσσεσθαι] to speak in riddles. pres. partic. 710.6
 ἀκρόασις] hearing; recitation, lecture(s) (in a title) 1.82, 727 no. 1
 ἀλεῖν] to grind (grain) 730.5
 ἄλς] salt; pl. (mixed with barley-groats in sacrifices) 730.1
 ἀνατιθέναι] to attribute (a proverb to Chilo) 738.5.1; to set up (an inscription in Tegea) 738.5.3
 ἀνὴρ] man 737.1, (Deinos) 624.2
 ἄνθρωπος] man; pl. men, human beings (given a s share in philosophy) 729.2; (learned to grind grain) 730.5
 ἄξιος] worthy (of remembrance) 740.3
 ἀπόφθεγμα] apophthegm, saying 737.3, 738.2
 ἀποχειροτονεῖν] to vote down, aor. partic. (a proposition of Deinos) 624.2–3
 ἀρετή] virtue 529A.4, B.1
 ἀρχαίος] ancient (diet) 730.3
 ἀρχή] rule, office 737.1
 αὐλεῖν] to play the *aulos*, partic. 718.2
 αὐλητής] *aulos*-player 718.1
 βελτίων] [better, pl. (of the votes of the minority compared with the votes of the majority) 624.7
 βρώσις] meat; diet (of an earlier period) 730.3
 γέλοιος] ludicrous (in a title) 710.8
 γινώσκειν] to know; impv. (in a proverb) 738.1
 γνώμη] thought, opinion; proposition, motion (voted down) 624.3
 δεικνύναι] to show 737.1
 δειλινός] in the afternoon; pl. (in a title) 1.185, 727 no. 2
 δεξιός] on the right, (hand) 624.4
 δημηγορικός] political; pl. (in a title) 737.1
 διαδιδόναι] to pass on, hand down; pass. (of a story) 729.2
 διαίρειν] to divide (the words of a proverb) 710.9

- δικάζειν] to give judgment; (with δίκην) to judge a lawsuit 738.5.6
δικαιοσύνη] justice 529A.4, B.1, 2
- ἐλεγεία] elegy; pl. (in a title) 737.2
ἐλάσσων] smaller, fewer; pl. (of voters) 624.7
- ἐπίγραμμα] epigram (inscription in Tegea) 738.5.2
ἐπικυροῦν] to ratify (the vote of the minority) 624.7
ἐπιστολή] message, letter 1.18, 374.3, 727 no. 16b; pl. (in a title) 1.192, 276, 588.3, 727 no. 15, 16a
ἐπιχεῖν] to pour on; to sprinkle on (barley-grouts) 730.2
ἐπιχειροτονία] vote (of the minority) 624.7
ἐρωτικός] erotic; pl. (in a title) 1.224, 727 no. 4
ἐσθίειν] to eat (whole barley grains) 730.5
εὕρημα] an invention, discovery; pl. (in a title) 1.199, 727 no. 11, 728.4, 730.4, 734.1
εὕρησις] invention, discovery; (in a title) 666 no. 4
εὕρισκειν] to find; to discover/invent (the potter's wheel) 734.2, (the art of words) 736A.3, B.3, C.3
εὐσεβεῖν] to act piously 529A.2
- ζῶον] animal; pl. (on which barley-grouts are sprinkled) 730.2
- ἡδονή] pleasure; (in at title) 549.1
ἠθικός] ethical; pl. (in a title) 1.224, 529A.6, 727 no. 4
ἦθος] custom; disposition; pl. (in a title) 529A.6
- θαυμαστός] amazing, surprising (were both to use the same proverb) 529B.4
θεός] god; (Apollo) 738.3
θύεσθαι] to sacrifice (animals) 730.2
- ἱεουργεῖν] to sacrifice; pass. partic. (of animals) 730.2
ἱστορεῖν] to inquire, to do research 740.1; to report or record (in the books on discoveries) 728.4, (without book title) 624.5
ἱστορία] history; research (in a title) 1.203, 727 no. 8
ἱστορικός] historical; belonging to research (in a title) 196A.3, 727 no. 7
ἰχθύς] fish (in a proverb) 710.5, 10; (lacking voice) 710,7
- καιρός] time (fixed); critical moment (in relation to all that is noble) 738.5.4
κακός] bad (in singing) 710.4, 6; neuter sing. (opposed to justice) evil 529B.1
καλός] noble; neut. pl. (all things) noble 738.5.4
καρπός] fruit of the earth; (Demeter's) crop 730.5
κεραμεικός] of or for pottery; of the potter's wheel 734.2
κῆρυξ] herald, (of the assembly in Tarentum) 624.3, 6
κιθαριστής] cithara-player, (Stratoniscus) 710.1
κιθαρωδός] cithata-singer, (Propis) 710.2
κίνησις] motion, pl. (bodily) 718.2

κρείσσων] stronger, (of the hand, i.e., force) 624.4

κύριος] authoritative; Doric fem. sing. (of a proposition or motion) ratified, valid 624.1

λόγος] word, speech; pl. (art of) 736A.2, B.2, C.3

μανθάνειν] to learn (to grind grain) 730.4

μαρτυρεῖν] to bear witness 738.1

μέγας] large (person) 710.4, 7, (fish in a proverb) 710.5, 10

μεταδιδόναι] to give a share (in philosophy to mankind) 729.1, 3

μηχανή] device; (of the potter's wheel) 734.2

μνήμη] memory (of the ancient diet) 730.3; (worthy of) remembrance 740.3

μῦθος] story (of Prometheus giving mankind a share in fire) 729.2

νικᾶν] to conquer, to win, partic. winning (motion) 624.4

ὀρχεῖσθαι] to dance, (called σικελίζειν) 718.3

οὐδεῖς] no one, none (of a fish) 710.5; nobody (of a person) 710.6

οὐλαί] barley-groats (sprinkled on sacrificial animals) 730.1, 6

οὐλοχύται] sprinkled barley-groats 730.1

παλαιός] ancient, pl (the ancients used the word σικελίζειν) 718.3
παροιμία] proverb 529A.5 (twice),

B.2, 549.2, 710.8, 9, 738.1; pl. (in a title) 710.3, 727 no. 14, 737.3, 738.2
παροιμιάζεσθαι] to speak in proverbs 529A.1

παροιμιάδης] proverbial saying 624.1
πασάμενος] (aor. partic. of unat-tested πάσμαι [LSJ s.v.]) having acquired 529A.3

πέπλος] robe in a title 735.1, 736A.1, B.1, C.3

πλείων] more; pl. (of the votes of the majority) 624.6

πλουτεῖν] to be rich 529A.3

ποιητής] poet (Homer) 730.6

πολεμικός] of war; neut. pl. military matters 624.2

πολίτης] citizen, pl. (of Tarentum) 624.3

πολιτικός] political; pl. (in a title) 1.224, 727 no. 4

πολυπλήθεια] great quantity, abundance (signified through sacrifice) 730.3

πρόβλημα] something thrown forward; problem; pl. (in a title) 1.224, 226, 227, 137 no. 26a, 727 no. 3, 4

προοίμιον] introduction; pl. (in a title) 737.1

προσιστορεῖν] to report in addition (to what Theophrastus reported) 624.5

πρώτος] first (of Prometheus) 729.2, (of Andron) 718.1; (book or roll) 529A.6 (twice), B.3 (twice)

πῦρ] fire (given to mankind by Prometheus) 728.3

ῥυθμός] rhythm, pl. (expressed by the body) 718.2

- σαπρός] rotten (fish) 710.10
 σικελίζειν] word for dancing among
 the ancients 718.2
 σοφός] wise (of Prometheus) 729.1;
 pl. (in a title) 1.231, 727 no. 12
 στρατηγεῖν] to be a general; partic.
 (of Deinos) 624.2
 σύγγραμμα] writing, treatise 666
 no. 4
 συλλήβδην] collectively 529A.4, B.1
 συναγωγή] bringing together;
 collection (in a title) 1.226, 727
 no. 3
 σῶμα] body (of a singer) 710.4, (of
 an aulos-player) 718.2
 σῶς] safe and sound; pl. whole,
 intact (grains of barley) 730.5
 τέχνη] art (of words) 736A.2, B.2,
 C.3; skill (in singing) 710.4
 τροχός] wheel; (the potter's) 734.2
 τρυφή] luxury, (of the Ionians) 549.2
 ὑπερβολή] excess (of luxury) 549.2
 ὑποκριτής] actor, (Simycas) 710.9
 ὑπόμνημα] reminder; note,
 memorandum; pl. (in a title)
 196A.4, 727 no. 7
 φιλοπονία] love of labor, industri-
 ousness 740.2
 φιλοσοφία] philosophy (given to
 man by Prometheus) 729.2
 φυσικός] concerning nature, natural;
 pl. (in a title) 1.224, 227, 137
 no. 26a, 727 no. 4
 φύσις] nature; the character,
 whether innate or acquired, of
 an individual 740.2
 χρυσοῦς] golden (proverb) 549.2

Latin

- aes] copper; bronze (copper mixed
 with tin) 731.1
 ars] art (of words) 736A.2, B.2
 augur] prophet (of Pythian Apollo)
 582.1, 3
 capere] to take; to undertake; to
 begin (to prophesy, of Apollo)
 582.2
 cognatus] related by blood;
 kinsman (of Euechir's relationship
 to Daedalus) 733.1
 conflare] to fuse (copper and tin to
 produce bronze) 731.1
 corvus] crow, raven; (with a golden
 beak atop of Tisias' rod of
 precedence) 736A.1, B.2
 deus] god (in an explanation of
 Theophrastus' name) 735.1
 filius] son (Cadmus of Agenor) 735.5,
 (Palamedes of Naucelus) 735.6,
 (Simonides of Leoprepus) 735.7
 gens] race (of Corvinus) 736C.1
 inficere] to dye (wool, invented by
 the Lydians at Sardi) 732.3
 insula] island (of Delos) 582.2

- intellegere**] to understand; to interpret (a name) 735.1–2
- invenire**] to discover/invent (letters of the alphabet) 735.3, 7, (the art of words) 736A.3, B.3
- inventio**] discovery/invention (of letters of the alphabet) 735.8
- lana**] wool; pl. (to dye, invented by the Lydians at Sardis) 732.3
- lapicidinae**] stone-quarries (invented by Cadmus) 732.1
- liber**] book (*Robe*) 736A.2
- littera**] letter of the alphabet, pl. 735.3, 4, 5, 8
- murus**] wall, pl. (invented by Thrason) 732.2
- nomen**] name, (proper noun) 736A.3
- numerus**] number (of letters of the alphabet) 735.5
- occidere**] to kill (the snake that prophesied) 582.2
- peplus**] robe (in a title) 582.1, 736A.1, B.1
- pictura**] painting (originated by the Egyptians) 733.1
- primus**] first (to discover/invent letters) 735.3
- prophetare**] to prophesy (of a serpent) 582.2, 3
- proprium**] proper (noun/name) 735.1, 736A.3
- regula**] rule; pl (of Theophrastus handed over to the Latins by Corax) 736C.2
- rhetor**] orator (of Corvinus) 736C.1
- secundus**] second; pl. of the Phoenicians in regard to inventing letters of the alphabet 735.3
- serpens**] a creature that creeps; a snake or serpent (that prophesied) 582.1–2
- signum**] sign; emblem (of a crow) 736A.1
- temperare**] to alloy (to mix copper and tin in due proportion) 731.1
- textile**] woven fabric; pl. (invented by the Egyptians) 732.3
- turris**] tower; pl. (invented by the Cyclopes or Tiryntians) 732.2
- verbum**] word; pl. (art of) 736A.2, B.2
- vocare**] to call; passive to be called (Pythian prophet) 582.3, (*Robe* as a title) 736A.2

2. *Titles of Books**Theophrastean Greek*

- Ἀκίχαρος] 1.273, 727 no. 13
 Ἀκρόασις] 1.82, 727 no. 1
 Δειλινοί] 1.185, 727 no. 2
 Ἐπιστολαί] 1.192, 588.3, 727 no. 15
 Ἐπιστολαί αἱ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀστυκρέοντι,
 Φανίᾳ, Νικάνορι] 1.276, 727 no. 16a;
 cf. 16b
 Ἠθικά] 529A.6, B.4
 Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα] 196A.3–4, 727
 no. 7
 Πέπλος] 727 no. 10, 735.1, 736A.1,
 736B.1, 736C.3
 Περὶ γελοίου] 710.7–8
 Περὶ εὐρημάτων] 1.199, 727 no. 11,
 728.4, 730.4, 734.1
 Περὶ εὐρήσεως] 666 no. 4
 Περὶ ἡδονῆς] 549. 1
 Περὶ ἡθῶν] 529A.6, B.3
 Περὶ ἱστορίας] 1.203, 727 no. 8
 Περὶ παροιμιῶν] 1.148, 737.14
 Περὶ τῶν προβλημάτων φυσικῶν]
 1.227, 266, 137 no. 26a
 Περὶ τῶν σοφῶν] 1.231, 727 no. 12
 Προβλήματα πολιτικά, φυσικά,
 ἔρωτικά, ἡθικά] 1.224, 727 no. 4
 Προβλήματα συναγωγῇ] 1.147, 727
 no. 3
 Ὑπομνήματα] by either Aristotle or
 Theophrastus 196A.4, 727 no. 7

Latin

- Commentum] 268.1, 288.3, 727
 no. 9b
 Commenta, liber Commentorum]
 168.3, 178.2, 180.1, 190.1, 284.9–10,
 286.1, 290.1, 292.1, 342.4, 343.3,
 344.3, 448.1
 Peplus] 582.1, 736A.1, B.1

Arabic

- Kitāb fi l-masā'il aṭ-ṭabī'īya] 137
 no. 26b
 Kitāb masā'il] 727 no. 5

Non-Theophrastean Greek

- Ἐλεγείαι by Sophocles] 737.2
- Περὶ παροιμιῶν by Clearchus]
710.2–3
- Προοίμια δημηγορικὰ by Demos-
thenes] 737.1
- Ῥυτίνος] attributed to Apollodorus,
but the text is almost certainly
corrupt 624.6
- Ὑπομνήματα] by either Aristotle or
Theophrastus 196A.4, 727 no. 7

3. Gods, Persons, Groups of People and Places
Named or Referred to in Greek, Latin or Arabic Texts

- Agenor]** the father of Cadmus 735.5
- Akikharos/Acicharus]** Ahiqar the
Aramean 1.273, 727 no. 13
- Andron]** of Catania, who was first
to make rhythmical movements
with his body while playing the
aulos 718.1
- Antiphanes]** unknown, except
for the report that he recorded
barbarian discoveries 728.2
- Apollo]** the god who began to
prophecy at Delphi after killing
the snake 582.2
- Apollodorus]** he added to Theo-
phrastus' account of Deinon's
rejection of an unfavorable vote
624.5
- Aristodemus]** student of Aristar-
chus, recorded barbarian discov-
eries 728.2
- Aristotle]** of Stagira, Peripatetic,
possibly the author of *Memo-
randa* 1.237, 373.1, 587.1 727 no. 6;
recorded barbarian discoveries
728.3; believed that Scythes of
- Lydia showed how to produce
bronze 731.1; that the Cyclopes
invented towers 732.2, that the
Egyptians invented painting and
in Greece Euchir 733.2
- Astycreon]** to whom letters are
addressed 1.276, 727 no. 16a
- Bias]** of Priene 737.4
- Cadmus]** putative founder of
Thebes, inventor of stone-
quarries 732.1, brought letters
of the alphabet to Greece 735.4,
6
- Catania]** in Sicily, whence the
aulos-player Andron 718.1
- Chilo]** of Sparta to whom sayings
are attributed 738.2, 3, 738.5.1
- Clearchus]** Peripatetic, native
of Soli on the proverb "Know
yourself" 738.3, wrote *On Proverbs*
710.2
- Cleolas]** of Thebes, who came after
Andron 718.3

- Corax**] invented the art of words 736A.3, B.2, C.3; handed over the rules of Theophrastus to the Latins 736C.2
- Corinth**] the city of Hyperbius 734.1
- Corvinus**] from his race or clan developed Roman rhetoric 736B.1; identified with Corax, who handed over the rules of Theophrastus to the Latins 736C.1
- Critias**] attributed a saying to Chilo 738.5.2.
- Cydippus**] of Mantinea 728.2
- Daedalus**] legendary inventor; kinsman of Euchir, who is credited with inventing painting 733.1
- Deinon**] the Tarentine, who was good in military matters 624.1
- Delas**] the Phrygian, showed how to produce bronze 731.2
- Delos**] an island at the center of the Cyclades, which is confused with Delphi 582.2
- Demeter**] the goddess, whose crop men learned to grind 730.5
- Demosthenes**] 737.1
- Diodorus**] pupil of Speusippus and contemporary of Theophrastus (the philosopher or the archon?) 740.1
- Egyptians**] credited with inventing woven fabrics 732.3; so too in regard to painting 733.1 and letters 735.3
- Eperatus**] the father of Sodamus, to whom a saying is attributed
- Eresus**] on Lesbos, native city of Theophrastus 728.1
- Euchir**] kinsman of Daedalus, originator of painting in Greece 733.1
- Greece**] to which Cadmus brought letters of the alphabet 735.4; the adjectival form is applied to Palamedes 735.6
- Hyperbius**] of Corinth, invented the potter's wheel 734.1
- Ionians**] their excessive luxury 549.1
- Latins**] to whom Corax handed over Theophrastus' rules of speaking 736C.2
- Leoprepus**] the father of Palamedes 735.7
- Lydia**] located in the western part of Asia Minor, from which Scythes hailed 731.1; Lydians at Sardis invented dying wool 732.3
- Mantinea**] in southeast Arcadia, native city of Cydippus 728.2
- Mytilene**] on Lesbos, native city of Scamon 728.1
- Naclus**] i.e., Nauplius, the father of Cadmus 735.6
- Nicanor**] Aristotle's nephew to whom letters are addressed 1.276, 727 no. 16a
- Palamedes**] the son of Naclus and a Greek invented four letters of the alphabet 735.6

- Peripatetic]** identifying epithet of Strato 728.4
- Phanias]** Peripatetic, native of Eresus, to whom letters are addressed 1.17, 276, 374.3, 727 no. 16a–b
- Philostephanus]** of Cyrene, recorded barbarian discoveries 728.3
- Phocylides]** mentioned a proverb 529A.7, B.4 and who may have used it 529A.7, 8 and B.5
- Phoenicia]** maritime country on the coast of Syria, whose inhabitants are credited with inventing stone quarries and letters of the alphabet 732.1, 735.3; hence letters are called Phoenician 735.4
- Phrygia]** in Asia Minor, whence Delas hailed 731.2
- Pittheus]** son of Pelops and king of Troezen, to whom Theophrastus attributes certain sayings 738.5.5
- Polygnotus]** Athenian whom Theophrastus credits with inventing painting 733.2
- Propis]** cithara-singer from Rhodes 710.2
- Pytho]** Delphi; the adjectival form, “Pythian,” became an epithet of Apollo, indicating that the god killed the serpent Python 582.1, 3
- Rhodian]** Propis the cithara-singer 710.2
- Roman]** rhetoric stems from the race of Corvinus 736C.1
- Sardes]** chief city in Lydia, where dying wool was invented 732.3
- Scamon]** of Mytilene recorded barbarian discoveries 728.1
- Scythes]** of Lydia showed how to produce bronze 731.1
- Sidon]** from which Cadmus hailed 735.5
- Simonides]** the son of Leoprepus invented four letters of the alphabet 735.7
- Simycas]** the actor insulted by Stratonicus
- Sisyphus]** founder and king of Corinth, to whom Theophrastus attributes certain sayings 738.5.5
- Sodamus]** the son of Eperatus, to whom a saying is attributed 738.5.2, 3
- Solon]** of Athens, statesman and poet 737.2
- Sophocles]** of Athens, tragedian 737.2
- Speusippus]** whose pupil was Diodorus 740.2
- Strato]** of Lampsacus, Peripatetic, recorded barbarian discoveries 728.3
- Stratonicus]** the cithara-player 710.1, 8
- Syracuse]** in Sicily; adjectival form applied to Corax 736A.3, B.3, C.2, 3
- Tarentum]** Italian city on the west coast of Calabria across from Brundisium on the east coast; the general Deinon was a Tarentine 624.2

Tegea] city located in the Peloponnese southwest of Argos; it is where Sodamus set up an inscription, on which was written *inter alia* "Nothing in excess." 738.5.2

Thebes] city in Boeotia, where Cadmus invented stone-quarries 732.1; from where Cleoas hailed 718.3

Theognis] to whom a proverb is attributed 529A.1, B.2 and who may have used it 529A.8, B.5

Theophrastus] possibly the author of *Memoranda* 1.237, 727 no. 6; on the disproportionate size of male pheasants 373.1; on services performed by the Magnesians 587.1

author of *On Discoveries*, in which he spoke of eating barley grains intact 730. 4; of Hyperbius inventing the potter's wheel 734.1; recorded barbarian discoveries 728.1

author of *Peplus*, in which he discussed the invention of the letters of the alphabet 735.1; mentioned Corax of Syracuse, who invented the art of words 736A.1–2, B.1–2, C.2–3; explained why Apollo is called the Pythian prophet 582.1

author of *On Pleasure*, in which he

refers to the Ionians and their excessive luxury 549.1

author of *On the Ludicrous*, in which he mentions the excessive pleasure of the Ionians 710.7

Theophrastus (no work cited) said that Prometheus gave men a share in philosophy 729.1; that Delas showed how to produce bronze 731.2; that stone-quarries were invented in Phoenicia and towers in Tyrins 732.1, 2–3; that the Athenian Polygnotus originated painting 733.2

author of *On Invention* 666 no. 4

Theophrastus discussed the attribution of proverbs in *On Proverbs* 737.3, 738.1–2, in *On Dispositions* 529A.6, B.3, in the *Ethics* 529A.6, B.4 and with no Theophrastean work cited 624.5 and 738.5.5

Theophrastus is said to deny things 739.1; to be a contemporary of Diodorus 740.2; to be a source(?) 741.1

Thrason] the putative inventor of walls 732.2

Tiryntians] the people of Tiryns (invented towers) 732.2

Ulpian] a diner in Athenaeus' *The Sophists at Dinner*, about whom a question is asked by the Cynic Cynulcus 710.1

VIII.

INDICES TO THE COMMENTARY

1. *Passages Cited in Chapters II–V*

ACHAEUS OF ERETRIA		ANONYMOUS	
Fragments		<i>On Aristotle's APo</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> 20 fr. 12–13	86	2.15 98a24	84
AELIAN		<i>On Aristotle's EN</i>	
<i>Miscellaneous Histories</i>		4.2 1121a7	71
7.14	228	5.3 1129b29–30	71–72, 207–211
9.11	167	<i>Life of Aesop</i>	
<i>On the Nature of Animals</i>		101–127	122–123
Epilogue	18	<i>Light of the Soul B</i>	
AESCHYLUS		7–10, 37–39, 49, 56, 61, 63, 72	
<i>Prometheus Bound</i>		99–101	
444, 446, 457, 459–462, 469, 477,		ANTIGONUS	
497, 503, 506	151–152	<i>Amazing Stories</i>	
AGROITAS OF CYRENE		130	62
Fragments		ANTIPHANES	
<i>FGrH</i> 762 F 4	151	Fragments	
[ALCIDAMAS]		<i>CAF</i> 91 = <i>PCG</i> 91	234
<i>Art. script.</i> 22.16.24	183	<i>CAF</i> 289 = <i>PCG</i> 282	
PS.-ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS			219
<i>On Aristotle's On Sophistic Refutations</i>		APOLLODORUS OF ATHENS	
4 166b1–9	51–52	Fragments	
ALEXIS		<i>FGrH</i> 244 F 151	86
Fragments		APOLLONIUS PARADOXOGRAPHER	
<i>CAF</i> 136 = <i>PCG</i> 156	130	<i>Amazing Stories</i>	
		46	25
		49.1–3	42, 130

APOLLONIUS OF RHODES		3.3 1112b19	113
<i>Argonautica</i>		4.2 1121a7	22
1.972	63	4.8 1128a7–8	241
2.1231–1259	150	4.8 1128b1–3	241
4.818–821	61	5.1 1129b29–30	22, 44, 211, 213
		5.1 1130a1–2	211, 213
APOSTOLIUS		5.10 1135b11–19	22, 44
<i>Collection of Proverbs</i>		6.10 1142b34–1143a18	
cent. 4.1 Leutsch	212		118
cent. 13.34	125	6.11 1143a19–24	197
		7.2 1146b8	113
ARCHIPPUS		10.7 1177b28–34	219
Fragments		<i>Eudemian Ethics</i>	
CAF 14–33 = PCG 14–34		2.2 1220b7	241
	26	3.5 1232b6–7	233
CAF 27 = PCG 27	26	3.7 1234a4–10	241
		<i>Politics</i>	
ARISTO OF CEUS		5.3 1285a10	230
Fragments		5.3 1303a4–7	232
8, 10.2–3, 11.3–4, 13A.8–9 Stork et al.		6.5 1320b9–14	228, 233
	83	<i>Rhetoric</i>	
		1.2 1356a1	115
ARISTOPHANES		2.4 1382a13	97
<i>Wasps</i>		2.20 1394a3	115
725–726	224	2.21 1394a21–28	197
		2.21 1395a19	197, 215
ARISTOTLE		2.21 1395a20–23	118, 199
<i>Topics</i>		2.21 1395a23–26	218
1.1 100b21–22	205	2.21 1395a32–33	222
<i>Physics</i>		2.24 1402a17–20	190
2.3 194b19	80	3.10 1411b12–13	153
<i>Research on Animals</i>		3.11 1413a14–20	197
4.11 538a22–28	87	3.17 1418a26	115
5.31 557a23	134	<i>Poetics</i>	
8.12 597a7–8	97	2 1447b25	10
<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i>		2 1448a5–6	168
1.2 1094a26 – 1.4 1095a17		3 1448a31–34	112
	78	4 1449a15–24	107
2.7 1108a25–26	241	6 1449b27–28	42
3.3 1112a27	113	9 1451b1–32	94

20 1456b20–26	180	29 950a20	81
20 1456b31–32	186	30 953a9	81
21 1457b6–16	197	36 965b1–17	80
25 1460b6	78	<i>Rhetoric to Alexander</i>	
25 1461a21–23	52	2.14 1424a13–19	233
26 1461b30–31	194		
Fragments		ARISTOXENUS	
13 Rose ³	199–200, 217,	Fragments	
	227	128–134 Wehrli	91
65	190		
136	190	ASPASIUS	
164	50	<i>On Aristotle's EN</i>	
501	185	7.15 1154b7–15	72
513.10	202		
593.8	202	ATHENAEUS	
598	223	<i>Sophists at Dinner</i>	
602	164	1.2 1D	26
639	104	1.3 2A–B	234
651–670	127	1.3 2A	26
31 Düring	76	1.4 3A–B	25
33	77	1.36–40 20C–22D	190–195
76	77	1.50 28C	182
		2.2 44B–C	27
PS.-ARISTOTLE		2.56 60D–E	196
<i>Letters</i>		2.59–60 61F–62A	28
4.1–5 (To Philip)	131	3.58 100E	95
<i>Problems</i>		4.1 128A	94, 238
2.17	80	4.4 130D	95
3.26 874b36–37	84	4.25 144E–145A	27–28
3.26 875a13–27	84	4.25 144E	71, 88
4.15 878b1–2	80–81	4.51 160C	125
6 885b14–886a29	80	4.70–72 170D–172F	86
10.8 891b21–24	87	4.73 172F	86
10.12 892a7–22	97	4.74 173 C–F	28, 86–89
17 915b37–916a39	80	5.47 211A	26, 71
19.10 918a29–34	10	5.52 213F	68
21.45 945a27–36	198	6.53 248E	130
21.46 945b2–4	198	6.16 255B	83
27 947b11	81	6.105 273C	28, 71
28 949a23	81	7.23 285C–D	204

<i>Sophists at Dinner (cont.)</i>		BĪRŪNĪ	
7.23 285C	125	<i>Collected Information</i>	
7.33 289A–D	130–131	s.v. lead	77–85
7.102 317A	125		
8.17 337A	125	CALLIMACHUS	
8.18 337D	95	<i>Hymns</i>	
8.39 347E	28, 71	3 (To Artemis). 46–50	
8.40 347F–348A	204, 225–227		162
8.40 347F	125		
8.46 352C	227	CHAMAELEON	
10.14 419C	83	Fragments	
10.86 457C	125, 203	8.2–3 Martano	71
11.58 479D–E	131	9.5–7	71
12.1 510A–B	234	43b	192
12.8 513E	234		
12.28 524F	234	CICERO	
12.31 526D	234–235	<i>Brutus</i>	
12.37 528E	234	46	190
12.53 537F	26	121	178
12.62 543E–F	167	<i>On Duties</i>	
12.79 553F	83	1.3	178
13.2 555C–D	204	1.14	178
13.2 555C	125	<i>On Ends</i>	
13.15 563F	83	1.6	178
13.16 564A	83	5.10–11	95
14.18 624A–B	42	5.12	73
14.28 630B	143	<i>Letters to Atticus</i>	
14.62 649E–650B	87	7.18.4	224
14.69 654A–D	86–89	16.11.3	105
15.9 669F	83	<i>Letters to Friends</i>	
15.15 673E–F	22, 71	16.17.1	10
15.16 674B	83	<i>On the Nature of the Gods</i>	
15.27 680E	61	1.35	23
15.33 686C	26, 86	1.93	12
15.52 696F	68	<i>Orator</i>	
15.62 701C–D	204	39	93
15.62 701C	125	62	178
		<i>On the Orator</i>	
		1.49	178

CLEARCHUS OF SOLI

Fragments

13a.8–9 Wehrli	83
21	83
22.3	83
24.1	83
25.2	83
63–83	126
63.I	125, 203
64	125
66A–C	125
69D	126
73	125, 204
75	125
78	125
80	125–126, 204,
	225
81	125, 204
83	125
84–95b	226

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Patchwork

1.14–16	142
1.14 61.1	108
1.14 63.5	25
1.15 69.4	120
1.16 74.1–76.10	143–145
1.16 74.2	145
1.16 75.4	65, 164
1.16 77.1	25, 106–112,
	142–145
1.16 77.2	143
1.17 87.1	154
1.21 102.6	64
2.2 9.5	25
3.3 24.1–3	24
6.1 2.1	105
6.7 57.3	25
6.18 167.2	25

CODEX

Laudenensis 444

f. 289 ^v	34, 101–103,
	177–186

Laurentius 73,1

f. 143 ^r	130, 271
---------------------	----------

Nuruosmaniye 3610

f. 1 ^r	85
-------------------	----

Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct.T.2.19

f. 7 ^v	37, 146–150
-------------------	-------------

Parisinus Graecus 2036

f. 1 ^r	81–82
-------------------	-------

f. 2 ^r	81–82
-------------------	-------

Parisinus Graecus 2653

p. 118 Sturz	110
--------------	-----

Parisinus Graecus suppl. 1198

f. 20 ^v	113
--------------------	-----

Parisinus Latinus 5253

f. 13 ^v	38
--------------------	----

Parisinus Latinus 12960

p. 16.16–23 Lutz	146–147
------------------	---------

Vaticanus Graecus 435

f. 220 ^r	202
---------------------	-----

f. 220 ^v	202
---------------------	-----

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

Against Julian

6.215	23
-------	----

Exhortation to the Greeks

5.66.5	23
--------	----

DEMETRIUS OF PHALERUM

Fragments

1.63 Stork et al.	206
1.115–116	205
81 no. 5	206
87	116–117, 204, 218
93	206
108	123, 206
149	127

DEMOCRITUS		19.73	179
Fragments			
68 B 299 Diels-Kranz		DIOGENES LAERTIUS	
	120	<i>Lives of the Philosophers</i>	
		1.13	30
DEMOSTHENES		1.22	206
<i>On the Embassy</i>		1.40	117–118, 202,
19.247	212		206
<i>Exordia</i>		1.41	116–117
48	211–212	1.42	117
		1.76	118
DICAEARCHUS		1.77	213
Fragments		1.80–81	206
21A–B Mirhady	131	2.55	68
22	131	3.48	138, 169
36	202	3.67–106	31
37	118	4.2	239
38	116	5.1–94	31
43	133	5.12–13	132
44	202	5.22	73, 199
53–77	131	5.23	88
56A	201	5.26	125, 196
57	201	5.35	31
58	173	5.36	32
68	131, 202	5.37	74, 127–134
75	202	5.38–41	32
91	202	5.38	179
97	202	5.42–50	67
98	193, 202	5.42	71, 74–76, 101,
109	131		210
		5.43–44	69, 93
DIODORUS OF SICILY		5.43	73
<i>Library of History</i>		5.44–45	19
3.4	181	5.45	74, 77–85, 92,
4.76	169, 175		95, 124–126,
8.6	157		200
16.77	179	5.46–50	68
18.8.3–4	132	5.46	63, 69, 75–77,
18.75.1	132		92, 126–127,
19.66	15		210

5.47	77–85, 93–98, 106–112, 114, 143, 194, 210	DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS <i>Dinarchus</i> 9 15, 179, 237
5.48	70–71, 77–89, 93, 111, 115–119, 145, 194–195	DUNCHAD <i>Glosses on Martianus Capella</i> 5.433 33, 101–106, 186–190
5.49	73, 77–85, 89, 91–92, 194	EPHORUS Fragments
5.50	63, 67, 70, 73–74, 111, 119–124, 127–134, 210	<i>FGrH</i> 70 fr. 42 108, 177 EPICURUS Letter to Menoeceus ap. Diogenes Laertius <i>Lives</i> 10.124
5.59	109	237
5.60	88, 108, 127, 144	ERIUGENA, JOHN SCOTUS <i>On Martianus Capella</i>
5.61	31	1.10 37, 101–106,
5.69	31	146–150
5.80	123	5.435 101–106,
5.81	123, 206	186–190
5.82	205	9.923 38, 178
5.83–86	31	apud Oxoniensem Bodleianum
5.86–94	110	Auct.T.2.19
5.88	110–111	f. 7 ^v 37, 146–150
5.93–94	31	
6.94–95	75–76	
7.34	237	EUDEMUS
7.38–159	31	Fragments
7.43	115	6 Wehrli 129–130
7.163	83	142 71
8.57	108, 190	
9.109	29	EURIPIDES
10.9–11	30	<i>Hippolytus</i>
10.27–28	8	250–266 221
10.124	237	<i>Iphigenia at Taurus</i> 1244–1258 148

<i>Medea</i>		HERACLIDES OF PONTUS	
716	113	Fragments	
		10 Schütrumpf	110
EUSEBIUS		17 no. 10–51	110
<i>Preparation for the Gospel</i>		39	235
10.5.14	106–112	144	110
EUSTRATIUS OF NIKAIA		HERMIPPUS	
<i>On Nicomachean Ethics</i>		Fragments	
1 & 6	43	6 Wehrli = 20 Bollansée	
			117
EUSTATHIUS		13 W = 11 B	117
<i>On the Iliad</i>		15a W = 12a B	117
vol. 2 p. 272.5 Van der Valk		16 W = 9 B	117
	181	HERODORUS OF HERACLEA	
GELLIUS, AULUS		Fragments	
<i>Attic Nights</i>		<i>FGrH</i> 31 F 30	151
4.13.1–2	42, 130	HERODOTUS	
20.5.5	77	<i>Histories</i>	
GEORGIUS CHOEROBOSCUS		1.25	65
<i>On Hephaestion's Handbook</i>		2.46	181
5.10.2	43, 112–115	5.58	183
GORGIAS OF LEONTINI		HESIOD	
Fragments		<i>Theogony</i>	
<i>FVS</i> 82 D–K	183	139–146	162
		281	172
HARPOCRATION		325	172
<i>Lexicon of the Ten Orators</i>		521	151
s.v. <i>archê andra deiknusi</i>		559	151
	124–126, 200,	565–567	151
	211–215	<i>Works and Days</i>	
s.v. <i>Polygnotos</i>	168	189	230
		370	223
HEGESANDER		Fragments	
Fragments		176 Rzach = 282 Merkelbach-	
<i>FGrH</i> vol. 4 p. 414	130	West	65, 164

HESYCHIUS

Lexicon

s.v. Ionikôn 235

Life of Aristotle

p. 83 Düring 199

Fragments

105–119 104

169 104

HIERONYMUS OF RHODES

Fragments

30 White 127

HOMER

Iliad

2.173 29

2.559 163

4.358 29

18.559–601 175, 177

23.327–328 51–52

Odyssey

2.352 29

2.366 29

4.555 29

5.60 15

17.343 158

24.118 158

[HOMER]

Hymn to Apollo

3.300–304 148

3.371–374 150

HYGINUS

Myths

274.17 161

277.1 185

IBN-ABĪ-UṢAYBĪʿA

Essential Information

4 (Theophrastus) 77–85

IBN-AN-NADĪM

The Index

s.v. Ibn al-Ḥammār (p. 265.10

Flügel) 77–85

ISOCRATES

Antidosis

181–185 153

Busiris

22 152–153

JEROME

On Distinguished Men

38 23

JULIAN

Beard Hater

349C 218

Orations

9[6].5 185A–B 219

LIVY

From the Founding of the City

7.16.1–12, 188

7.32.15 188

7.40.3 188

MACROBIUS

1.15.4 40

MARTIANUS CAPELLA

*On the Marriage of Philology and**Mercury*

1.1–10 146

5.426–438 (211.9–216.3–5)

186–190

MARTIN OF LAON		2.25.8	162
Codex Laudunensis 444		2.31.3	224
fol. 289 ^v	34, 101–103,	9.12.6	191
	177–186	10.24.1	216
MASURIUS		PHANIAS	
Fragments		Fragments	
<i>FGrH</i> 166 F 1	26	5 Engels	63
		38	227
MENANDER		PHEREKYDES OF ATHENS	
<i>Arbitrants</i>		Fragments	
180	113	<i>FGrH</i> 3 F 7	151
Fragments			
<i>CAF</i> 240 = <i>PCG</i> 181	219		
METRODORUS		PHILODEMUS	
<i>On Research</i>		<i>On Death</i>	
1 <i>FGrH</i> 184 F 2	62, 91	P Herc. 807, col. 14.10	
			236
MICHAEL OF EPHEBUS		<i>Herculaneum Index of Academics</i>	
<i>On Nicomachean Ethics</i>		P. Herc 1021, col. Q.4–5	
5, 9, 10	43		240
5.3 1129–1130	207–211	P. Herc 1021, col. T.1–6	
5.3 1129b29–30	44, 71–72		237–239
5.10 1135b11–19	44	<i>On Love of Reputation</i>	
10.5 1176a3–4	43	P. Herc. 1025, tab. 14	
			240–241
OLD TESTAMENT		<i>On Music</i>	
<i>Sirach</i>		3.35	9
38.32	175	<i>On Rhetoric</i>	
		P. Herc. 1007/1673, col. 13	
OVID			10
<i>Metamorphosis</i>		vol. 2, p. 50 Sudhaus	
4.34	161		76, 240
5.650	165	<i>On Vices and Opposing Virtues</i>	
6.9	161	P. Herc. 1424, col. 7.37–38.18	
			8–9
PAUSANIAS		PHOCYLIDES	
<i>Description of Greece</i>		Fragments	
2.19.5	64	10	209

PHOTIUS		339C	118
<i>Lexicon</i>		342E–343A	115, 117–118
s.v. <i>archê andra deiknusi</i>		343A–B	206
21		343C	199
s.v. <i>kyrbeis</i>	157	<i>Republic</i>	
<i>Library</i>		1.3 329A	196
190 148b20	126	5.17 472D	181
278 525a30–529b23		<i>Sophist</i>	
128		231C	196
		<i>Timaeus</i>	
PINDAR		77A	139
<i>Odes</i>			
Ol. 13.1–48 = 1–35	54–55, 171–172	PS.-PLATO	
Pyth. 2.1–9 = 1–5	55–56	<i>Demodocus</i>	
		383C	223
PLATO			
<i>Cratylus</i>		PLINY THE ELDER	
384A–B	196	<i>Natural History</i>	
<i>Gorgias</i>		praef.29	12
449A4–5	189	1.7	108, 177
<i>Laws</i>		3.58	15
1 631C	205	7.1	12
2 659B	231	7.187	13
3 677A–C	136	7.191–215	13, 165–166,
5 741D	196		190
6 755D	231	7.191	160
6 756B	231	7.192	162, 185
<i>Lysis</i>		7.193–194	64
216C	196	7.194	160, 176
<i>Menexenus</i>		7.195–196	12, 159–171,
247E	196		185
<i>Phaedrus</i>		7.197	12, 65,
236A3–6	113, 115		159–171, 185
265D–266B	154	7.198	175
274D–E	180	7.201	164
<i>Philebus</i>		7.204	184
16C	154	7.205	12, 14, 159–171,
<i>Protagoras</i>			185
322D	154	7.209	176
338E–347A	204	7.210–214	13

Natural History (cont.)

8.1	13
12–27	14–15
13.101–102	15
15.1	15
19.32	15–16
26.99	15
27.63	15
34.76	169
35.8	189
35.11	105
35.15–16	167
35.58	14, 166–168
35.65	166
35.72	166–167
35.152	169

PLINY THE YOUNGER

Letters

3.5.11	11
3.5.14–15	11
6.16.7–20	11

PLUTARCH

Lamprias Catalogue

no. 138	18
no. 139	18
no. 166	18

*Morals**On How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend*

14 57C	241
25 66C	241

Sayings of Kings and Commanders

Gelon 175A–B	56
--------------	----

Roman Questions

25 269E–270D	18
29 271D	18
87 285B–D	18

Greek Questions

7 292C–D	19
31	18
35	19
36–37	18
39	18
42	19, 227–233
45–51	18
53–55	18
58	18

Isis and Osiris

10 354F	181
---------	-----

Divine Vengeance

6 551F–552A	57
-------------	----

Whether an Old Man Should Engage in Public Affairs

26 796D	133
---------	-----

Precepts of Statecraft

15 811B	213–214
---------	---------

The Malice of Herodotus

38 869D	19
---------	----

Stoic Self-Contradictions

8 1034E–F	223–224
-----------	---------

Reply to Colotes

7 1110C	8
---------	---

*Lives**Agésilas*

21.5	131
------	-----

Alcibiades

10.3	115
------	-----

Camillus

19.12	18
-------	----

Cicero

15.2	127
------	-----

*Comparison of Demosthenes and**Cicero*

3.2	212
-----	-----

Cimon

4.6	168
-----	-----

<i>Pericles</i>		PRUDENTIUS OF TROYES	
38.2	72	<i>On Predestination against John Scotus</i>	
<i>Romulus</i>		14, <i>PL</i> vol. 115 col. 1194A	
15.7	18		35
<i>Solon</i>			
4	116		
<i>Theseus</i>		REMIGIUS OF AUXERRE	
3.2	223	<i>On Martianus Capella</i>	
16	19	1.10	149
		2.208	39
POLYBIUS		5.435	39, 101–106,
<i>Histories</i>			186–190
16.36.4	127	9.923	40
29.26.1	118	9.926	41–42
PORPHYRY		SCAMON OF MYTILENE	
<i>Abstinence from Eating Animals</i>		Fragments	
2.5.1–2.32.3	136–142	<i>FGrH</i> 4 T 1	143
2.5.6	201		
2.6.1–2	157	SCHOLIA	
2.13.3–4	157	on Apollonius' <i>Argonautica</i>	
2.21.1	157	1.879	60
2.27.2	57	1.972	63, 127,
2.56.5	57		133–134
4.2.6	201	1.1129–1130	64
<i>Life of Plotinus</i>		2.1248–1250	64, 140,
24	69		150–156, 249
<i>On Claudius Ptolemy's Harmonics</i>		4.200	61
p. 65.13–15 Düring	42	4.272–274	173
p. 115.4–5	71	4.818–821	61
Fragments		4.834	61, 89–93
142	71	on Aristophanes' <i>Birds</i>	
		1354	157
POSIDONIUS		on Aristotle's <i>EN</i>	
Fragments		4.2 1121a7	71
284.114–118 Edelstein-Kidd		on Dionysius <i>Thrax</i>	
	177	<i>GG</i> vol. 1.3 p. 183.13–15 Hilgard	
			183
		<i>GG</i> vol. 1.3 p. 185.3–7	
			184

on Dionysius <i>Thrax</i> (<i>cont.</i>)		SIMONIDES	
GG vol. 1.3 p. 191.30–31		Fragments	
184		PMG 542.13 Page	118
on Euripides'			
<i>Hippolytus</i>		SIMPLICIUS	
265	59, 220–225	<i>On Aristotle's Physics</i>	
<i>Orestes</i>		6 introduction	130
965	162		
on Hermogenes		SOCRATES OF CONSTANTINOPLE	
vol. 4 p. 297 Walz = vol. 2 p. 59		<i>Ecclesiastical History</i>	
Rabe	77	3.23	104
on Homer's <i>Iliad</i>			
1.449	53, 106–112,	SOLON	
	156–159,	Fragments	
	249	T 199 Martina	212
6.168–187	181	87.21 Stock	218
17.559	181		
23.269	50	SOPHOCLES	
23.328	51–52	<i>Antigone</i>	
on Pindar's		175–177	212
Ol. 13.26–30=18–22	54, 106–112,	Fragments	
	171–177	TrGF 363 Radt	64, 134
Pyth. 2.1–9=1–5	55–56		
on Theocritus' <i>Idylls</i>		SOSIADES	
V 21/22a p.161.15–16 Wendel		<i>Collection</i>	
125		no. 47–48 (ap. Stobaeus 3.1.173)	
		207	
SEMOS OF DELOS			
Fragments		SOTION	
FGrH 396 F 7	86	ap. Diogenes Laertius 5.86	
		1.4–5 Schütrumpf	110
SENECA			
<i>Moral Epistles</i>		STESICHORUS	
90.31	177	Fragments	
		36 Page	183
SERVIUS			
<i>On Vergil's Aeneid</i>		STOBAEUS	
3.73	149	<i>Anthology</i>	
<i>On Vergil's Georgics</i>		2.7.5b7	24
1.19	143	3.1.172	116, 204–205,
			218

3.1.173	123, 206	TACITUS	
3.3.42	123, 157	<i>Annals</i>	
3.21.1–13	216, 218–219	11.14	181
3.21.12	124–126, 200,		
	215–220	THEOGNIS	
4.20.64	97	<i>Elegies</i>	
		147	208
STRABO			
<i>Geography</i>		THEOPHRASTUS	
1.2.31	49	<i>Characters</i>	
7.3.9	108, 175, 177	17	97
8.6.10–11	163	<i>Explanations (Causes) of Plants</i>	
10.3.22	165	1.1.1–10	96–97
13.1.54	25	1.5.3	96
13.1.55	91	1.19.5	15
13.2.4	179	5.15.1	24
16.2.39	120	<i>Letter to Phantias</i>	
		ap. Diogenes Laertius 5.37	
STRATO OF LAMPSACUS			32, 63,
Fragments			127–134, 248
1 Sharples	109	<i>Research on Plants</i>	
1.56	88	3.15.6	16
1.57–58	127	4.3.6	64, 134
1.87 no. 2	88	5.3.7	15
17	109	5.4.3	51–52
42	108	5.7.6	61
82	108–109, 144	6.6.9	61
84–86	108	7.13.8	16
		9.1–20	92
SUDA		9.15.2	15
s.v. <i>archê andra deiknusi</i>		9.17.3	17
	21, 212	9.17.4	15
s.v. <i>Didymos</i>	49	9.18.9	15
s.v. <i>Epicharmos</i>	186	<i>On Stones</i>	
s.v. <i>Hellanikos</i>	143	1.6	162
s.v. <i>Simonidês</i>	184	<i>On Winds</i>	
		46	198
SYNESIUS		Fragments	
<i>Encomium of Baldness</i>		1.12–13	32
22	199, 217	1.16	74

Fragments (cont.)

1.16-21	127-134	1.227	77-85
1.21	132	1.230	194
1.30-31	179, 229	1.236	195
1.42-45	32	1.237	71, 86-89, 91
1.52-59	32	1.241	71, 93
1.68-291	67	1.243	98, 115-119
1.69	101	1.245	70, 98, 111, 145
1.73	71	1.252	68
1.82	74-76	1.260	194
1.84	210	1.263	89, 91-92
1.89-94	69	1.266	77-85
1.92	63	1.271	70, 111, 128
1.108-115	69	1.272	67, 70, 98, 111, 128
1.111-115	93	1.273	119-124
1.115	95	1.275	68
1.134	19	1.276	63, 71, 127-134
1.136	95	1.279	124
1.143	74	1.281	210
1.144	124	1.283	210
1.146	92	1.288	74
1.147	77-85	1.289-291	71
1.148	124-126, 200	3A	66
1.163	19	5A	179
1.172	92, 95	5B	178, 229
1.180	210	6	38, 41, 102-103, 178
1.185	75-77		
1.188	76	7A-B	127
1.189	68	10 no. 9-10	25
1.192-194	69	11 no. 5	25
1.199	106-112, 114, 143	12	192
1.200	210	18 no. 5	115
1.201	93	18 no. 9	94
1.203	93-98	18 no. 10	95
1.210	94	18 no. 13	45
1.213	194	app. 25	45
1.223	194	35	20
1.224	77-85	37.1-20	25
1.226	77-85	39.7-8	69
		40.1-7	25

50	178, 229	252A	23
51	178, 229	252B	23–24
52A–B	178, 229	264 no. 2–3	70, 98, 111, 128
53	178, 229	265 no. 1–3	100
54	178, 229	267	99–101
61A–B	12	268	48, 99–101
66 no. 10	76	271	24
68 no. 7a	101	280.1	8
68 no. 10	93	283	48, 100
76	95	284	99–101
134 no. 3	69	285	48, 100–101,
136	84		247
137 no. 15a	19	286	99–101
137 no. 18b	19	287–288	48
137 no. 26a, b	72, 77, 84–85	287	100–101
137 no. 34–38	69	288	99–101
137 no. 43	70, 98, 111, 128	289	99–100, 247
138	12	290–292	99–101
157	130	301B	25
166	40	307A	24
app. 166	40, 102–103	322A	24
167	99	323A–B	24
168	99–101	328 no. 14	69
170	99	340	27
178	99–101	342–344	99–101
179	99	344	48
180	99–101	350 no. 5c	69
181	99, 247	373	86–90, 246
183	77–85	374	63–64,
190	99–101		127–134
191	99	384 no. 1c	95
192	19	384 no. 2c	24
196A	61–63, 89–93,	384 no. 1f	96
	246	385	95
196B	62	app. 403	51
201	20	408	15–16
232	45	413 no. 4	15
236	45	413 no. 5–7	28
250	48, 99	413 no. 32	15
251 no. 1	98	413 no. 48	20

<i>Fragments (cont.)</i>		503-505	79
413 no. 54	61	503	45
413 no. 52	15	506	49, 99
413 no. 55	15	app. 516	71
413 no. 59	15	516	22, 71
413 no. 64	60	517	45
413 no. 84	16	518	127, 131
413 no. 86	20	521	45
413 no. 110	15	523	45, 123, 157
417 no. 15	24-25	526	45
436 no. 1	21, 72, 235	528	35, 249
436 no. 2	22, 72	529A-B	71-72, 201, 207-211, 213, 235, 243, 251
436 no. 2a	235		
436 no. 3	210		
436 no. 7	210	530	22, 44
436 no. 8	210	531.17	139
436 no. 9a	210	534	125
436 no. 10	210	538F	45
436 no. 19a	22	539	45
436 no. 26	235	542	224
436 no. 27a-b	235	549	201, 228, 234-235, 251
436 no. 27b	28		
436 no. 29	73	550-551	235
436 no. 33	73	550.5-6	28, 71, 235
437	22	552A-B	26, 167, 181
437.2-5	22, 72	553.2	28, 71, 235
437.3	71	555.7	72
443-445	45	557	45, 78, 97, 224, 235
448	48-49, 99-101		
449A	45-46, 225	558	45, 78
449B	221	565	45
463.5	72	567A-B	26
465	45	569.3	28
469	45	570.2	28
481	118-119, 203	572.1	28
483-485	24	573.1	28
483	219-220	574.1	28
486	45, 203	575.1	28
497	229	576.5	28
498.1-3	73	578.3-4	127

579A–B	26, 44	649	20
580 no. 3	136, 138, 157	650	45
582	37, 101–106, 139, 142, 146–150, 177, 247	651	20
		652	50
		653	20
		656–658	20
583	116	659	9
584A	57, 136–142, 155, 157–159, 167	660	9
		661–662	45
		666 no. 4	43, 72, 112–115, 247
584A.28	201		
584A.78	57	666 no. 7	118
584A.282–286	57–58	666 no. 14	93
586	55–56	666 no. 17a	94, 186
587	28, 86–90, 246	666 no. 20 and no. 21	
			52, 194
588	126–129	666 no. 23	235
589 no. 1	74	666 no. 24	195
589 no. 2	74	676.28	117
589 no. 4–6	79, 124	681–704	202
589 no. 8	89, 91	681	186
589 no. 12	88	683	174
589 no. 17	58, 95	689A–B	10, 174
589 no. 23	56, 58	689A	240
590	95	690	174
599	15	695.3–4	117
603	88	696	187
603.1	27	697	93
603.2	28	705.2	115
624	19–20, 197, 201, 227–233, 243, 251	709	163
		710	126, 201, 204, 220, 225–227, 235, 251
627	20		
628	45	714 no. 1	194
632	20	714 no. 2	194
633	20	716.130–132	42
635	20	718	190–195, 250
636C	20	720	9
641–645	20	726A–C	42, 130
647	20	726A	104

Fragments (cont.)

726A.1-4	42		153, 155, 159, 249
727 no. 1-16b	243-248	730	53, 106-112, 114, 140-142, 156-159, 249
727 no. 1	74-76, 78, 124		12, 14, 65, 114, 145, 159-171, 185, 249
727 no. 2	75-78, 124		12, 14, 114, 145, 159-171, 185, 249
727 no. 3	32, 52, 72, 77-85, 124, 186	731	106, 114, 138, 159-171, 175, 185, 249
727 no. 4	72, 77-85, 186		54-55, 106-112, 114, 142, 159, 169, 171-177, 250
727 no. 5	72, 77-85, 186	732	14, 34, 38, 101-106, 142, 177-186, 244, 247, 250
727 no. 6	28, 71, 78, 86-89, 91, 106		33, 35, 37-40, 101-106, 142, 177, 186-190, 244, 247, 250
727 no. 7	62, 72, 89-93, 156	733	20-21, 124-126, 200, 205, 211-216, 243, 248, 251
727 no. 8	93-98, 156		45-46, 59, 108, 119, 124-126, 200-201, 205, 214-220, 222, 244, 248, 251
727 no. 9a	72, 99-101	734	215, 220-225, 235, 251
727 no. 9b	72, 99-101		
727 no. 10	35, 37, 72, 101-106		
727 no. 11	53, 106-112, 114, 140, 142-143, 155, 158	735	
727 no. 12	115-119, 123, 225	736A-C	
727 no. 13	119-124		
727 no. 14	45, 118, 123-126, 200, 209, 211, 216, 225, 233	737	
727 no. 15	63, 69, 78, 124, 126-134		
727 no. 16a	63, 127-134	738	
727 no. 16b	32, 63, 127-134		
728	25, 106-112, 142-145, 243, 248		
729	64, 111, 114, 135, 140, 151,	738.5	

739–741	10–11, 243	VICTORINUS	
739	235–237, 252	<i>Grammar</i>	
740	237–240, 252	1.4.95–96	184
741	240–241, 252		
Appendix 9	174	ZAWZANĪ	
		<i>Selections</i>	
THUCYDIDES		s.v. Ibn-al-Ḥammār (p. 164.18	
<i>History</i>		Lippert)	
1.1.1–21.2	135		77–85
1.2.2	161		
1.70	198	PS.-ZENOBIOUS	
5.1	161	<i>Summary of the Proverbs of Didymus</i>	
7.1	161	<i>Tarrhaeus</i>	
8.3	161	2.15	202
8.68.1–2	233	2.100	193, 202
		3.65	202
TIMAEUS		3.99	202
<i>Fragments</i>		4.26	202
<i>FGrH</i> 566 F 143a	51	5.23	201
		6.16	202
VERGIL			
<i>Aeneid</i> 8.317	157		

2. *Subjects Discussed in Chapters II–V*

- abstinence]** from eating animals/meat 57, 136, 157, 201
- accents]** mistakes 51–52
- affection]** 221, 224
- alphabet]** 14, 34, 102–103, 143 n. 18, 162, 177–186, 244, 247, 250
- alphabetization]** strict and otherwise 20, 67–70, 74, 78–79, 86, 93, 106, 119, 127–128, 211, 245
- analogy]** 96–97, 153 n. 44
- ancient]** of proverbs 41, 50, 195–196, 199–200, 217 n. 239, 224 n. 257, 251
- anger]** 97–98, 122 n. 156, 218, 224
- animals]** 69–70, 87, 95–97, 136–140
- archaeology]** rational account 135
- art]** see painting. rhetoric and skill
- attractive/pleasing style]** of expression 179, of proverbs 195, 197, 202, 210 n. 223
- aulos/pipe]** 41–42, 103, 190–195, 202 n. 199, 244, 250
- authorship]** disputed 28, 71, 86–89, 235 n. 290, 246
- backside]** of a papyrus roll 238–239
- barley-groats]** 53, 138, 140–141, 156–158, 249
- beans]** bad effects 24; compared with the wood-louse 64, 133
- beginnings]** 135–195
- bit]** by which a horse is checked 54–55, 138 n. 9, 169 n. 96, 172–173, 176 n. 126
- boorishness]** 241
- brevity/conciseness]** in sayings/proverbs 117, 195, 199–200, 203, 226
- bronze]** 65 n. 202, 114, 145, 163–164, 185, 248–249
- catharsis]** 42
- contests]** athletic 165, dramatic and athletic 205, chariot race 50, 55, stadion race and the pentathlon, painting 166–167
- controversy]** alleged between Theophrastus and Dicaearchus 118–119, 203
- copper]** 65, 160, 163–164
- courage]** 81, 232 n. 284
- course of lectures]** 74–76, 246
- critical moment/particular situation]** 79, 124, 219, 222, 226
- culture, cultural history/achievements]** 13, 114, 155, 166, 172 n. 107, 193 n. 169, 201, 203–204, 250–251
- dancing]** called “sikelizing” 191–195, 250
- delivery]** of orators, actors, musicians 187, 191–195
- denial]** 236–237, 252
- derivation]** of words, see **etymology]**
- developmental]** account 136–142, 201 n. 197, 248
- devolutionary]** account of sacrifice 138–139, 155; of musical performance 194
- disagreement]** between Aristotle and Theophrastus 162–163, 165–166, 169–171, 185, 249–250; Theophrastus and Dicaearchus 118, 203

- discovery**] 98 n. 87, 105, 106–112, 135–195, 243, 248–251
- dialogue**] 8, 27, 57, 73, 108 n. 117, 138, 158–159, 190 n. 161, 199
- disease**] see **illness**
- doctor**] self-important Syracusan 130–131
- dyeing**] of wool 160–161
- education**] early/moral 9–10, 48, 210–211
- emotion**] 42, 78 n. 28, 97, 115, 198, 218, 224
- epistle**] see **letter**
- eros/lust**] 45, 78–79, 81, 83–84, 221, 224, 235, 246
- esoteric, exoteric works**] 42, 72–73, 107, 108 n. 117, 133 n. 196, 158, 178
- etymology**] 149, 158–159, 169 n. 98, 188, 192–193, 249–250
- excess**] (nothing in excess) 221–225, 251; (affection) 221 (lust) 45, 224; (luxury) 234–235
- fabrication**] letters/epistles 121, 131, 133
- familiar/part of public discourse**] of the proverb 196, 199, 209, 224
- faultfinding**] 97–98
- fire**] underwater volcano (?) around the Strait of Messina 61–62, 90–91; given by Prometheus 64, 135, 149, 151–155; by Phoroneus 64
- fish**] big bad/rotten 126, 204, 225–227, 251
- games**] see **contests**
- general**] (elected military office) 19–20, 227–229, 232–233, 252
- greatness of soul**] 233
- grinding/ground grain**] 13, 53, 114, 137–138, 140–142, 156–159, 249
- hand**] valid or stronger 229–230, 252
- hare**] in a proverb 197–198
- hate**] 97, 222 n. 254
- hieroglyphics**] 180–182, 250
- history**] 11–12, 14 n. 21, 21–23, 47, 70–72, 80, 87 n. 54, 90–95, 97 n. 83, 98, 110–111, 208, 246, 251
- household management**] 8–9
- humor**] see **ludicrous**
- ignorance**] unseemly (of boorishness) 241
- illness**] 41–42, 130–131
- improvements**] as firsts 14, 138, 172–173 n. 111, 176
- intellect/intellectual**] 48, 114, 119 n. 147, 153 n. 44 214 n. 233, 219–220, 233, 237
- invention/inventors**] 13, 34, 105–107, 112–115, 243–244, 247–251
- iron**] 64–65, 143 n. 18, 163 n. 74, 164
- judge**] to judge a lawsuit 221–225
- justice/injustice**] 44, 68, 76 n. 22, 81, 208–211, 213, 251
- κατά**] in the time of 238–239, 252; according to 240, 252
- law**] 73, 95, 197 n. 183, 205, 208, 212, 221 n. 247, 230, 233
- lawgiver**] 118
- lawsuit**] 221–225, 251
- legislation**] 13–14, 81, 202 n. 201
- λέξις**] see **style**

letter/character] see **alphabet**

letter/epistle] 63–64, 127–134, 245, 248

library] of P. Livius Larensius 25, 38, 243–244, in Alexandria 59–60, 67 n. 1, 68–69, 79 n. 33, 143 n. 22, 204

ludicrous] 38, 49 n. 152, 73, 225–227, 235

luxury] Athenian 135, 235 n. 289; Ionic 234–235, 251

marriage] 24, 132, 146, 202–204

mass words] 161 n. 66

mathematics] 70, 98, 111, 145

maxim] 29, 118, 197–199, 200 n. 194, 218–219

metaphor] 10, 126, 153, 155, 173–174, 193 n. 170, 197–198, 203, 226, 240, 249

meteorology] 19, 89 n. 56, 90–91, 198, 246

Milky Way] 39–40, 102–104, 244

mind] 23–24, 41–42, 103

movable] sayings 59, 117, 211, 223, 227, 251; replies 131

movement] rhythmical while playing the aulos 191–195, 250; all kinds while lecturing 192; the nature of music 42

music] 9–10, 40–42, 102, 136, 165–166, 190–195, 227 n. 264

mythology] 54, 59, 65, 89, 98 n. 87, 105, 111, 135, 136 n. 2, 140, 146–150, 150–156, 160, 162, 171, 247

name] Theophrastus, philosopher 12 n. 15, 38, 40–41, 102–103, 178–179, 229, 244, 250; abbreviation 99–101; homonyms (archons) 31,

179, 239–240 n. 308; Κόραξ 37 n. 115, 39, 188, 250; Pythian 146–150, 244; Deinon 229

nature] innate or acquired character 79, 239 n. 307; natural talent 32, 143, 175 n. 119

noise] originating in the Aeolian Islands 62–63

notes] students' classroom notes 36, 43, 88, 113, 244, 246

oak] oak or pine 51; fruit of the oak, acorn 137–138, 140 n.15, 201

painting] 14, 114, 138 n. 9, 165–171, 181, 185, 249–250

papyrus] 3, 120 n. 152, 126 n. 170, 236–241

philosophy] 30, 34, 118 n. 146, 237 n. 295; proverbs 199, 202, 217 n. 239; given by Prometheus 64, 111, 114, 140, 150–155, 249

piety] 57–58, 123, 128, 136–142, 155–158, 248

pipe] see **aulos**

plants] research on plants 82 n. 41, 90 n. 64, 95–97; an aphrodisiac, citrus wood and the wool-bearer 14–17; oak and pine wood 51–52; lily and narcissus, various woods 60–61; grasses, trees etc. in sacrifices 137–138

potter's wheel] 108, 114, 169 n. 99, 227 n. 266; (basic and kick-wheel) 168–169 n. 96, 174–177, 250

practical] life 118; raising children 211; skill 152; wisdom 153; injunctions 205; sayings 118; proverbs 219, 251; characteristic of a maxim 198; practical help

- lacking in writings on metaphor 10
- problems**] collections 72, 77–85, 243, 246
- pronunciation**] of double consonants/sigmatic compounds 186
- prophecy/prophet**] 102, 105 n. 110, 146–150, 247, 249
- proverb**] 20–22, 44, 46, 59, 118, 120–121, 123–126, 195–235, 243–244, 247–248, 251–252; in relation to saying, see below **saying**
- quarries/stone-cutting**] 145, 160–162, 248–249
- research**] 11, 14–17, 51–52, 61–64, 70–72, 82 n. 41, 110–111, 246
- rhetoric/art of words**] 33, 36–37, 39, 76–77, 91 n. 63, 93–94, 102, 105, 108 n. 117, 112, 114–115, 117–118, 152 n. 40–41, 153 n. 44, 187–190, 197, 206 n. 214, 209, 222 n. 249, n.254, 229, 244, 246, 247, 250
- riddle**] 126, 203–204, 226, 251
- sacrifice**] developmental/devolutionary account that condemns blood sacrifice 136–142; humans 44–58; animals 237 n. 295; hospitality at Delos and Delphi 86; barley, inexpensive offerings and bad etymology 156–158
- saying**] 108, 117–119, 122–123, 200, 211–212; in relation to proverb 198, 200, 205, 210 n. 223, 214–218, 243, 247–248, 251–252; of Aristotle 30, of Theophrastus 31, 45–46
- scholia**] 7, 21–22, 44, 49–65, 89–92, 106–107, 125–128, 133–140, 150–159, 162, 164, 171–177, 182–185, 201, 220–225, 245–246, 249–251
- sciatica**] 42
- serpent**] Pytho 37
- Seven Sages**] see **Wise Men**
- σίκελιζειν**] 191–195, 250–251
- skill/τέχνη**] Prometheus and philosophy 151–154, Corax and rhetoric 189–190
- στοιχεῖα**] 180–181, 183
- stone-cutting**] see **quarries**
- style/λέξις**] 21, 71–73, 87, 93–94, 107 n. 117, 112–115, 117, 171, 178–179, 186, 194–195, 197, 202, 229
- superficial character traits**] 73
- talent**] see **nature**
- temperance**] 40, 81, 102, 210; intemperance 9
- towers**] 114, 160–163, 185, 249
- tragedy**] (catharsis) 42; tragic history 94, 107 n. 117
- valid**] 19, 228–232, 252
- vegetarian**] 136 n. 1
- virtue**] moral: Aristotle's definition 46; the role of music 9–10; see **courage, greatness of soul, justice, temperance**
- walls**] 114, 160–163
- weaving**] 136, 160–161
- Wise Men/Sages**] 30, 115–119, 175, 202, 204–206, 213, 216, 224 n. 257, 225, 247, 251; Prometheus 151; Simonides 184; the wise Aramean 120–124
- wood-louse**] 63–64
- wool**] 160–161; wool-bearer (bulb) 16

IX.

CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDA IN THE TEXT TRANSLATION VOLUMES

The corrections and additions listed here all need to be made in the first printing of 1992. The corrections and additions in reduced type were made in the second printing of 1993 and therefore are relevant only to the first printing.

1 apparatus] vol. 1 p. 30 line 3 fb, at the end of entry 144, change “727 no. 3” to read “727 no. 3a”

1 apparatus] vol. 1 p. 36 line 7 fb, at the end of entry 226, change “727 no. 3” to read “727 no. 3b”

1 translation] vol. 1 p. 39 line 3 fb of the translation, after “*On*” and before “*Problems concerning Nature*” insert “*the*”

11 no. 5] vol. 1 p. 62 line 1, instead of “63.4” read “63.5”

11 no. 5] vol. 1 p. 63 line 1: instead of “63.4” read “63.5”

66 no. 1.5 = new entry] vol. 1 p. 110, below 66 no. 1 and above no. 2, enter the following: “1.5 Cod. Laurentianus 73, 1 fol. 143^r (Wellmann, *Hermes* 35 [1900] p. 370), quo loco Theophrastus in tabula auctorum medicinae nominatur”

66 no. 1.5 = new entry] vol. 1 p. 111, below 66 no. 1 and above no. 2, enter the following: “1.5 Cod. Laurentianus 73, 1 fol. 143^r (Wellmann, *Hermes* 35 [1900] p. 370), where Theophrastus is named in a list of medical writers”

137 no. 26b] vol. 1 p. 286, line 3 of the entry at end change 180 to read 183

137 no. 26b] vol. 1 p. 287, line 2 of the entry, after “vol.” and before “p.” supply the numeral “1”

below 137 no. 26b] vol. 1 p. 287, three lines below no. 26b, the third reference to 727, after “*The Problems*” change “*by Theophrastus*” to “by Theophrastus” (i.e., no italics)

413 no. 107] vol. 2 p. 231 line 7 (repr. line 6), after “both” add “of”

Section on “Virtue and Vice”] vol. 2 p. 280 at bottom (or top of p. 282) add as separate entry “vid. 738.5”

Section on “Virtue and Vice”] vol. 2 p. 281 at bottom (or top of p. 283) add as separate entry “see 738.5”

483 app. crit.] vol. 2 p. 307 line 2 of the *apparatus criticus* under the translation (referring to line 3 of the Greek text) instead of “vid. 78” read “vid. 77” and in line 3 of the *apparatus criticus* instead of “5 *Aristoteles*” read “4 *Aristoteles*” (correcting the line of the Greek text to which the entry refers)

582 below line 3] vol. 2 p. 402, above the critical apparatus and separated by a horizontal line, add the apparatus of parallel texts, reading “1–3 *cod. Cf. 53^r (Med. et Ren. St. 1 [1941–1943] p. 189 Labowsky = p. 16.16–23 Lutz) Theophrasto non nominato*”

588 line 1] vol. 2 p. 436 line 1 of text, add a smooth breathing to upper case alpha, i.e., read Ἀντίγονον

624 line 1] vol. 2 p. 466 line 2 fb, instead of “Δίνων” read “Δείνων”

624 app. crit.] vol. 2 p. 468, first line of the *apparatus criticus* (i.e., the lower apparatus), before “5–6 *cruces posuit Titchener*” add as a separate entry “1 Δείνων Crönert: Δίνων *codd.*”

666 no. 4] vol. 2 p. 508, line 1 of entry replace “Περὶ εὐρήσεως” with “Περὶ εὐρέσεως” and in line 3 replace “Περὶ εὐρήσεως;” with “Περὶ εὐρέσεως (*codd.*, Περὶ εὐρήσεως Caesar);”

727 no. 1] vol. 2 p. 585 line 2 of the text, replace “Lectures” with “Course of Lectures”

727 no. 3] vol. 2 p. 584 lines 4–5 of the text, divide entry 3 at the semi-colon, which is eliminated. The first half becomes “3a” and ends with “5.45 = 1”. The second half becomes “3b”. It begins a new line and reads “Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α’] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.48 = 1”

727 no. 3] vol. 2 p. 585 lines 4–5 of the text, divide entry 3 at the semi-colon, which is eliminated. The first half becomes “3a” and ends with “5.45 = 1”. The second half becomes “3b.” It begins a new line and reads “*Collection of Problems*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.48 = 1”

727 no. 5] vol. 1 p. 585, first line of entry, after “*The Problems*” change “by *Theophrastus*” to “by Theophrastus” (i.e., no italics)

727 no. 7] vol. 2 p. 584 line 2 fb, instead of “182A” read “196A”

727 no. 7] vol. 2 p. 585 line 2 fb, instead of “182A” read “196A”

727 no. 10] vol. 2 p. 587, line 1 of the entry, print “Glosses on Martianus Capella” in italics; line 2 of the entry, print “On Martianus Capella” in italics; lines 6–7 of the entry, print “On Martianus Capella” in italics

727 no. 13] vol. 2 p. 587, line 5 fb, replace *Akikharos* with *Acicharus*

727 no. 16a] vol. 2 p. 588, line 1 of the entry. Instead of “16a” read “16” and in line 2 instead of “1” read “1.276; cf. 1.17–18 et 374.23”

727 no. 16a] vol. 2 p. 589, line 1 of the entry. Instead of “16a” read “16” and in line 2 instead of “1” read “1.276; cf. 1.17–18 and 374.23”

727 no. (16)b] vol. 2 p. 588, lines 1–2 of the entry, delete entire entry

727 no. (16)b] vol. 2 p. 589, lines 1–2 of the entry, delete entire entry

728 line 4] vol. 2 p. 588 line 13, instead of “Περὶ εὐρημάτων” read “περὶ εὐρημάτων”

728 line 5] vol. 2 p. 589 line 14, instead of “*On Discoveries*,” read “on discoveries”

732 line 2] vol. 2 p. 590 line 7 fb, after “Thrason muros” replace the comma with a semicolon

732 line 2] vol. 2 p. 591 line 7 fb, after “Thrason (invented) walls” replace the comma and the immediately following conjunction “and” with a semi-colon

732 line 3] vol. 2 p. 590 line 6 fb, remove the final sentence beginning with “Aegyptii” and ending with “Lydi”

732 lines 4–5] vol. 2 p. 591 lines 4–5 fb, remove the final sentence beginning with “The Egyptians” and ending with “of wool”

733 translation] vol. 2 p. 593 line 2 of the translation, delete “but” (no replacement), and in line 3 instead of “according to Theophrastus” read “as Theophrastus thinks”

734 below line 2] vol. 2 p. 592, below the Greek text create a critical apparatus that reads “1 μὲν DE: δὲ Qv, *de quo vid. commentaria vol. 9.2 p. 173-4*”

735 line 3 fb] vol. 2 p. 593, in the translation instead of “Simonidis” read “Simonides”

vid. 718 = new reference] vol. 2 p. 594, below the apparatus to text 736C and above the heading “Proverbia” add the new reference “vid. 718”

see 718 = new reference] vol. 2 p. 595, below the translation of text 736C and above the heading “Proverbs” add the new reference “see 718”

vid. 529A–B = new reference] vol. 2 p. 594, below the section heading “Proverbia” and above text 737 add the new reference “vid. 529A–B”

see 529A–B = new reference] vol. 2 p. 595, below the section heading “Proverbs” and above text 737 add the new reference “see 529A–B”

738.5 = new text] vol. 2 p. 596, below the apparatus to text 738 and above the new reference “vid. 710” add the following as a new text:

“738.5 Scholion in Euripidis Hippolytum 265 (vol. 2 p. 39.3–8 Schwartz)

Τὸ μὴδὲν ἄγαν οἱ μὲν Χίλωνι τῷ Λακεδαιμονίῳ ἀνατιθέασιν,
ὡς Κριτίας, οἱ δὲ Σωδάμῳ, ὡς τὸ ἐν Τεγέᾳ ἐπίγραμμα δηλοῖ·

ταῦτ' ἔλεγεν Σωδάμος Ἐπηράτου, ὃς μ' ἀνέθηκεν
μὴδὲν ἄγαν, καιρῷ πάντα πρόσεστι καλά.

ὁ δὲ Θεόφραστος, ὡς τὰ Σισύφου λεγόμενα καὶ Πιτθέως, οἶον
μὴδὲν ἄγαν, μὴδὲ δίκαν δικάσης.”

738.5 = new text] vol. 2 p. 597, below text 738 and above the new reference “see 710” add the following as a new text:

“738.5 Scholium on Euripides' Hippolytus 265 (vol. 2 p. 39.3–8 Schwartz)

Some assign “Nothing in excess” to the Spartan Chilo, as Critias does,
but others assign it to Sodamus, as the inscription in Tegea shows:

Eperatus' son, Sodamus, who put me up, said the following:
“Nothing in excess” “All that is noble is timely.”

And Theophrastus (understood?), as things said by Sisyphus and
Pittheus, e.g., “Nothing in excess,” “Do not judge a lawsuit.””

vid. 710 = new reference] vol. 2 p. 596 below the new text 738.5 and above the existing reference “vid. 624” add the new reference “vid. 710”

see 710 = new reference] vol. 2 p. 597 below the translation of new text 738.5 and above the existing reference “see 624” add the new reference “see 710”

vid. 549 = new reference] vol. 2 p. 596 below the existing reference “vid. 624” and above the section heading “Ἀτακτα” add the new reference “vid. 549”

see 549 = new reference] vol. 2 p. 597 below the existing reference “see 624” and above the section heading “Unassigned” add the new reference “see 549”

739 = replacement text] vol. 2 p. 596 below the section heading Ἀτακτα replace the existing 739 with the following:

“739 Philodemus, *De morte*, P.Herc. 807, col. 20. 12–16 (Cerc vol. 39 [2009] p. 256 Giuliano)

Θ]εό-
φραστον ἀθετε[ί]ν ταῦτα·
πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὐδ’ ἐπι-
15 [χ]ειρεῖν ἔδει διὰ τοιούτων
[λόγ]ων”

739 = replacement text] vol. 2 p. 597 below the section heading “Unassigned” replace the existing 739 with the following:

“739 Philodemus, *On Death*, P.Herc. 807, col. 20.12–16 (Cerc vol. 39 [2009] p. 256 Giuliano)

that Theophrastus denied these
things. For first it was necessary
not to argue using such reasons”

740 = replacement text] vol. 2 p. 598 at top, replace the existing 740 with the following:

“740 Philodemus, *Index Academicorum Herculaneensis*, P.Herc. 1021, col. T.1–10 (p. 188 Gaiser [1988] and p. 135 Dorandi [1991])

γράφει δ’ ὑπ[έ]ρ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα
Διόδωρος, δς [ίστ]ορῶν κατὰ
Θεόφραστον γέγονεν ἀ-
πὸ Σπευσίππου· “φύσιν δὲ
5 καὶ φιλοπονίαν ἀξ{α}ιν
ἔσχε μνήμης· [ο]ὐ γὰρ μό-
νον περὶ τ[ῶ]ν ἐνδεχο-
[μ]ένων ἐπ[ρ]αγματεύθη{ι}
[κ]αὶ περὶ πάντων δ’ ἱκα-
10 [νά] τιν’ εἴρη[κ]εν”

740 = replacement text] vol. 2 p. 599 at top, replace the existing 740 with the following:

“740 Philodemus, *Herculaneum Index of Academics*, P. Herc. 1021, col. T.1–10 (p. 188 Gaiser [1988] and p. 135 Dorandi [1991])

About him (Seusippus) Diodorus, who did his research in the time of Theophrastus and was a pupil of Speusippus, writes these things. “He had a nature and industriousness worth remembering, for not only did he investigate everything possible and also expressed himself adequately about all things”

Index: Anonymous] vol. 2 p. 635 line 17 (repr. 20), instead of “(saec. 12 a.D.)” read “(saec. 2 a.D. exeunte)”

Index: Philodemus] vol. 2 p. 678 line 9 (repr. 13), instead of “(ineunte saec. 1 ante Chr.)” read “(c. 110–140 ante Chr.)”

Index: Photius, *Lexicon*, s.v. κῶρβεις] vol. 2 p. 680 line 18 (repr. 15) fb, instead of “584A” read “app. 584A”

Index: under “Scholia”] vol. 2 p. 692 above line 7 fb, i.e., above “In Homeri Iliadem,” add a new entry on two lines: first, “In Euripidis Hippolytum” and second “265 (vol. 2 p. 39.3–8 Schwartz)” with “738.5” at the end of the same line